THE NEW REPUBLIC

A Journal of Opinion

VOL. 104, NO. 25 NEW YORK, MONDAY, JUNE 23, 1941 NUMBER 1386

Funds Frozen

In last week's New Republic, we offered a list of ten suggestions for speeding up and intensifying the American war effort. One of these demanded that relations be broken with the Axis powers and that their property in this country be seized. The second of these things has now been done, except as regards Japan. The funds of Germany, Italy and the conquered European countries and of their nationals in the United States have been taken over; six other European countries, including Russia, are also put under strict control. Reprisals of course may be expected and are indeed already under way. In a monetary sense the United States is making a bad bargain, since our funds in these countries are usually larger than their funds here. From every other point of view, the move is a wise one. Indeed, it should have been done many months ago. Secretary Morgenthau asked for it over and over; but timidity or appeasement policy, or both, in the State Department held him back. As a result, most of the Axis funds in this country have now been safely hidden away. The gesture therefore becomes chiefly a political one. As an indication to the Axis powers that we mean business it has some value, and would be better if Japan were included. Still more valuable would be a concrete demonstration such as getting down to the production of war goods in dead earnest.

Consuls Sent Packing

Sending home the German consular agents in this country is another move that should have been taken long ago. These consular agents have been centers of Nazi propaganda and, undoubtedly, of even more serious activities. The undesirable actions of men like Captain Fritz Wiedemann in San Francisco, Baron Edgar von Spiegel of New Orleans and Dr. Herbert Scholz of Boston have been repeatedly described in the press. We have little to lose from retaliatory moves in Germany directed against our own consulates; Americans do not have the quaint habit followed by the Nazis of trying to do all possible damage to the government, political faith and civilization of the country to which they are accredited. On the closing of the consulates, the chief comment must be the same as that on the seizing of the Axis funds: Why was it not done months ago? And why does it not include Italy and Japan?

Nine More Actions Needed

We hope the preliminary steps already taken may soon be followed up by a complete breaking of relations with all the Axis powers. And we hope further for action on the other nine points proposed by The New Republic last week, which may be summarized as follows: 1. Start the navy shooting at once, if necessary, to protect convoys. 2. Send all possible material to help the British in the Near East. 3. Clear up the muddle, confusion and divided authority in the defense effort. 4. Control all prices and pass a stiff excess-profits tax. 5. Take any necessary steps to ensure reorganization of our defense in the light of the present importance of air power. 6. Expand plant without reference to probable post-war demand, rather than cause consumers to suffer now. 7. Dismiss those government officials in State, War and Navy Departments who are anti-democratic or not alive to the great national crisis. 8. Set up

CONTENTS

The Week 839
Editorials
Don't Appease Japan! 843
The Nazi-Soviet Enigma 844
The New Lincoln 845
General Articles
Will Conscripted Labor Work? . Michael Straight 846
Texas Kingfish . . . . . Wayne Gard 848
Why Britain Has No Labor Problem . . . . . William Steele McCauley 850
Design for Summer (verse) . . . Judd Polk 852
Americana . . . . . Van Wyck Brooks 853
Wilderness Battleground . Richard L. Neuberger 855
Washington Notes . . . . . T. R. B. 857
Fritz Lang and Company . . Otis Ferguson 858
The Bandwagon 859
Correspondence 859
Books in Review
Ambiguous Answers . . . . W. H. Auden 861
Finger Exercise . . . . Malcolm Cowley 862
Communism v. Common Sense . Louis Fischer 863
Riches for a Quarter . . . . . James Stern 863
Property and the Public . Willmoore Kendall 864
Horatio on the Bridge . . . Otis Ferguson 864
Reply to Mr. Ickes . . . Leonard Boudin 865
Report by the Scientists . . . . . B. B. 866

PUBLISHED WEEKLY AND COPYRIGHT, 1941, IN THE U.S.A. BY EDITORIAL PUBLICATIONS, INC., 40 EAST 49TH ST., NEW YORK, N. Y.
ENTERED AS SECOND CLASS MATTER, NOVEMBER 6, 1914, AT THE POST OFFICE AT NEW YORK, N. Y., UNDER THE ACT OF MARCH 3, 1879
PRINTED IN THE U.S.A.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

one agency to make sure that workers get decent treatment and living conditions, and are trained in the right numbers at the right times and places. 9. Force totalitarian propagandists in this country to reveal their identity and who pays them. Counter their work with clear and powerful statements about democracy.

No More Robin Moors

The almost miraculous rescue of all the passengers of the Robin Moor does not alter the seriousness of the incident. The German U-boat commander sank the ship without any attempt to examine her cargo, which was not contraband by the American definition of international law, though Germany now puts practically everything in that category. He set the passengers adrift in open boats in the middle of the ocean, which was practically a sentence of death, averted only by great good luck and the discipline and skill of the crew. He promised to radio for help for them and, as far as the evidence discloses, he broke that promise. The most significant part of the whole story, however, comes from Berlin. In advance, one would have taken it for granted that Germany would repudiate responsibility, probably accepting Senator Nye's happy little thought that the British had sunk the Robin Moor to get the United States into the war. On the contrary, Germany accepted responsibility and said she would do it again whenever opportunity offered.

Here is a plain defiance to America, in marked contrast to previous efforts at conciliation. Apparently Hitler has decided that the United States is now past cajolery, and is trying to bulldoze us. If so he is making a bad mistake. This is not because the Americans are especially heroic, but because the attempt to bulldoze an independent and powerful nation practically never works. The British are hoping we shall not start too much activity in the South Atlantic, and interfere with the all-important bridge of ships from America to their island; but these two things are not incompatible. It seems clear that we should immediately arm our merchantmen and give them the protection of the navy. If we don't, we are abandoning not only the freedom of the seas but our own right to be represented thereon.

The New Justices

There is something more than paradox in the fact that Mr. Justice Harlan Stone, a lifelong Republican, a classmate of Dwight Morrow and Calvin Coolidge, appointed successively Attorney General and Associate Justice of the Supreme Court by President Coolidge, should now be named Chief Justice by the Democratic New Deal President. Nor is it an anomaly that the new nominee, probably the ablest progressive member of the Court, should once have been associated with the conservative Wall Street firm of Sullivan and Cromwell.

Some day a good biography may reveal just how it came about that this safe and sound lawyer became a sturdy member of the Court minority when the reactionary majority were invalidating New Deal legislation, and, since the complexion of the Court has been changed, has sometimes constituted a forward-looking minority of one. Our impression is that Mr. Justice Stone, a native of New Hampshire, combines to a remarkable degree an uncompromising New England independence and insight with a mental balance which commands his associates' respect, whatever their views.

The appointment as Associate Justice of Attorney General Robert Jackson elevates a man of promise and ability—though it is a disturbing coincidence that he has recently given scope to that same Chief G-Man Hoover whom Attorney General Stone once effectually curbed. As for the President's choice of Senator Byrnes, one can hope for the best, regretting that Mr. Roosevelt's political bent caused him to overlook a dozen more highly qualified men.

The Battle of Prices

Wholesale prices at the end of May were 10 percent higher than last summer, when the defense effort began. Particularly sharp increases have occurred in raw and semi-finished commodities, which were eight percent higher at the end of May than in February, and have gone on up in recent weeks. Textile materials, hides and leather, chemicals, fuels and building materials are beginning to soar. Finished products have risen too, and retail prices are already showing the effect, particularly in foods and textile products.

Is this the start of an inflation which will have a serious effect on the cost of living if it is not promptly curbed? Many government economists fear that it is. There is no basic shortage in most of the products concerned; the increases are due to a sharp growth in demand which leads sellers to believe that they can charge more, and to speculative buying. In the case of farm products, there can be little objection to a moderate rise, since the farmers for long have not been able to keep up with the price procession. But in other lines government control seems immediately necessary.

This explains Mr. Leon Henderson's recent action against price increases on automobiles, textile products, hides and leather and other goods. That vigorous curbs can be effective is revealed by the fact that the controlled prices of metals, which went into effect earlier, have prevented increases in this sector since the end of last year, while twenty-two other basic commodities have gone up almost vertically. The battle of living costs is on.

Profits

Though Congress still hesitates to adopt the Treasury suggestion for relating the excess-profits tax to a percentage return on capital rather than to a base period, its committee is reported to be formulating a plan of its own to raise $1,000,000,000 more from this

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

source. The Treasury plan itself was too cautious; we hope, but hardly expect, that Congress will suggest something better instead of something worse.

Hardly any item of defense policy is more important than this. In view of the need of the money, in view of labor's loyalty, in view of the urgency of avoiding inflation, in view of high personal income taxes and the coming sacrifices of consumers, in view of the conscription of American boys for possible fighting at the lowest of pay, this democracy absolutely must prevent war profiteering. We suggest that the aim be, not to raise a given predetermined sum, but to channel to the Treasury all profits resulting from defense, and all profits larger than necessary to maintain production.

The Fight Is Still at Sea

The visit to New York of Sir Ronald Cross, England's World War Minister of Shipping, has again brought to the fore the paramount problem of the Battle of the Atlantic. Sir Ronald had a few encouraging words for certain aspects of this battle: that the German figures for sinkings were absurdly exaggerated and that until a few months ago British replacements, captures and inheritances from defeated nations had made up for losses at sea. Unlike the President, he insisted that the convoy was still the best means of protecting merchantmen except in the case of very speedy freighters. Britain's lack of destroyers for convoying was not, he believed, so important as it would have been in the last war because of the great developments in the technique of spotting and hunting submarines. Yet all these points, he emphasized, were of secondary importance to the problem of merchant-ship replacement. Britain is now at production peak, but her losses are still greater than her rate of replacement. The result of the war depends on sufficient production of Allied merchant ships, and such production will be possible only if the American effort is as great as it was in the last war. No amount of munitions, raw materials and foodstuffs can tilt the scale without the necessary bottoms; in fact, "Your rate of export *determines* the volume of your effort." It is this aspect of aid to Britain that must always be first in our minds, regardless of more spectacular events on other parts of the warfront.

The WPA and Democratic Decency

If Senate progressives will fight as valiantly for a decent WPA bill as did their House colleagues, a major threat to public morale and a great wastage of a useful labor force can still be avoided. Against bitter opposition, enlightened Representatives succeeded in rescinding the rule suspending WPA employees after eighteen months of employment and in unfreezing $50,000,000 earmarked for the food-stamp plan. Since the latter has always been financed by other means, this earmarking was simply an attempt to cut the WPA by that amount. The Senators must now fight to increase the appropriation: $875,000,000 will care for only about 1,000,000 of the 2,800,000 needy family heads eligible for the WPA. Congressmen from one state after another testified that this cut of 35 percent below the current appropriation will cause serious hardships in their home districts in Minnesota, Washington, Oklahoma, North Dakota, Louisiana, New York, Montana and elsewhere. Those who oppose decent treatment of the casualties of our depression use the defense program as an excuse for attacking the WPA. Actually, of our 3,073 counties only 761 have defense contracts, and in most of these counties the amounts involved are unimportant. Nor will employers willingly hire many WPA-ers, whose average age is forty-three and 20 percent of whom are women, when there are millions of the unemployed and the partially employed available.

The Senate should also undo the House's attempt to fire David Lasser by legislative action. It ill becomes the greatest deliberative body in history, upon which the eyes and the hopes of the world are fixed, to be playing tiddlywinks with the job of an able man simply because it does not like him. Even the hysterical Dies Committee said that Lasser was not a Communist.

Mr. Dunn Leaves Us Flat

Now that Gano Dunn has resigned from the OPM, whom will the President have to tell him that by some happy coincidence democracy's steel needs happen to conform exactly with what the steel industry in its wisdom wants to supply? With so many disturbing things coming out of Washington, the series of which the Dunn reports were a part was gratifying indeed. On Tuesday one could learn from the American Iron and Steel Institute that we needed no expansion of steel capacity. On Wednesday Mr. Dunn reported exactly the same thing, supported by exactly the same arguments. On Thursday the President blasted the fearmongers who disbelieved that the steel industry had supplied us with exactly the right steel capacity, supporting this with the arguments we heard on Tuesday and Wednesday and illustrating it with the same hearty humor found in the Dunn reports. It was too bad Mr. Dunn had to issue a second report proving his first one wrong. Since he did, and since Report No. 2 has also already been discredited, we find his Report No. 3, that carrying news of his resignation, the most reassuring of all. Can one be expected now to resist saying Well, Dunn, thou good and faithful, etc., and hope that his spiritual brothers on the OPM will emulate his good example?

Torpedoes Wild

On June 3 Senator Byrd told the upper house: "I have obtained from the War Department a report to the effect that at the close of business on May 31,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

thirty-four strikes were in existence on contracts for the War Department alone, with forty strikes reported by the Navy Department, making seventy-four strikes in army and navy contracts. . . ." We wish we had room to print the actual army and navy memoranda. Perhaps Senator Byrd would read them. When he made the headlines he had not read them, unless his purpose in speaking was deliberate misrepresentation.

The navy report mentioned thirty-nine strikes, not forty. Of these thirty-nine, it headed twenty: "Listed below are companies in which strikes are pending but information relative to naval defense contracts not yet available." In short, it had no idea whether they belonged on the list. Five strikes were the same ones listed by the army, and the Senator counted them twice in his grand total. Six were listed as settled or causing no work stoppage. Several were microscopic in size and did not touch the defense of so much as a rabbit hutch. One of the menaces to our national security, as Senator Byrd called them all, was a labor controversy between thirty-seven men and a small Southern lime company.

It is with this kind of research that the navy and Senator Byrd discover that between "1,500,000 and 2,000,000" man days have been lost "to date." One wonders how they can be sure it is not between 100 and 100,000,000. If torpedoes are fired with the same accuracy as these anti-labor broadsides, God save the King's ships from American submarines. And who will save us from Senator Byrd?

Declare War on Disease

The half-million men who have been sent to the South for their army training are in the most unhealthy districts in the United States. As Dr. C.-E. A. Winslow, professor of Public Health at Yale Medical College, points out in McCall's Magazine, the army is taking careful precautions to protect the health of the men within the boundaries of the camps, but the danger of infection from venereal disease and intestinal diseases in communities outside the military reservations is acute. He cites examples of a Florida camp located in a county which does not have a single health officer, of a Georgia camp occupying parts of three counties, none of which ever had a full-time health department, and of a camp in the midst of Louisiana malarial swamps.

The army is aware of the danger. It has appropriated money for mosquito control and is setting up CCC camps to give full-time aid in this work. It is borrowing experts from the Public Health Service to try to improve extra-cantonment sanitation. It also asks that an aroused public opinion force these Southern communities to clean house, since the army has no direct authority outside the camps and must depend on civilian agencies. But the health of these half-million men cannot wait for poverty-stricken Southern counties to disinfect themselves. The United States Public Health Service must be put on a war footing at once and given ample funds and full authority to stop epidemics before they start.

Illinois Strikes at the Refugee

It must be disconcerting to the refugee to have reached at last this great legendary haven and then to see his presence arouse this country's slumbering anti-foreignism and especially anti-Semitism. The latest place where this feeling has broken into the open is in the Illinois legislature, where the senate voted 34 to 11 to confirm twelve house bills barring aliens from various professions. The intent is to prevent refugee doctors, dentists, pharmacists, nurses, attorneys, chiropodists, barbers, beauty-parlor employees, veterinarians, architects, real-estate brokers and horseshoers from practising their professions in Illinois. Apart from the illiberalism and inhospitality thus displayed, the action is especially foolish in barring doctors and nurses at a moment when we face a shortage of them. Apparently there is not even exemption for Canadian nurses, upon whom we have depended for so long that they virtually staff whole hospitals. Since licensing and other requirements already raise almost insurmountable obstacles in many professions, since lawyers have always been required to be citizens to be admitted to the bar, why should a state legislature thus show its spleen? Or why couldn't it at least have confined itself to appeasing the native horseshoers' lobby?

News Notes of a Week

Philip Murray, president of the CIO, squashed reports by "scandalmongers" of "splits, purges and red hunts" in the CIO. He said the organization held to its fundamental policy of furthering collective bargaining and was composed of "loyal Americans." . . . Secretary Ickes spoke approvingly of Senator Connolly's suggestion that the government take over Alcoa if the company failed to "coöperate." If the war is lost, said the Secretary, "it may be because of the recalcitrance of the Aluminum Company of America." . . . Standard Oil of New Jersey defended its sales of oil to Japan by saying that it was not a private company's business to make decisions on international matters. "These are the functions of the government." Secretary Ickes seemed to think so too and acted decisively in halting the shipment from Philadelphia to Japan of a cargo of lubricating oil. . . . It is reported from Brazil that the United States may lend her $100,000,000 for construction of air bases opposite Dakar. Such bases would be invaluable for South Atlantic patrols and to help neutralize German penetration in West Africa.

The reason for British slowness in penetrating Syria appeared to be the recent forty-mile push into Libya. General Wavell apparently has chosen to divide his strength rather than go all-out into Syria. . . . Italy responded to the President's freezing of Axis credits

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

here with similar action on American credits in Italy. . . . From London came the rumor that Sir Stafford Cripps was unwilling to return to his post as Ambassador to Moscow. He was said to believe a Russian-British rapprochement to be impossible. . . . Prince Bernhard, husband of Princess Juliana of Holland, said the Germans "will have to take what is coming to them" after the war because they failed to do the right thing before Hitler came to power. The Prince was formerly a member of Hitler's SS guards.

Don't Appease Japan!

WHAT IS THE PRESENT POLICY of the United States government toward Japan? No one can say for certain; one of the unhappy facts at present is that Washington is being decidedly uncandid with the American people. There are however a group of facts which taken together have significance:

1. President Roosevelt conspicuously omitted Japan from the criticisms of the Axis powers in his fireside chat.

2. When we froze the funds of the Axis, Japan was not included.

3. The government has suddenly and without explanation stopped publishing statistics about our exports to various countries. This means that the American people no longer have any way of telling how much oil or other important war materials are being sent to Japan at the possible peril of our own defense effort.

4. As we reported last week, the administration sent two important officials to testify before the House Rules Committee, who urged that there should be no congressional investigation of the leakage of war materials to the Axis. This is true in spite of reports that large quantities of goods of all kinds are being bootlegged to Italy and Germany by American business men, just as was the case in the last war.

5. At the moment when the United States seems to lean toward Japanese appeasement, we are told that the British have at last turned their backs on it, convinced by experience that you can't conciliate the dictatorships.

6. That a firm stand against Japan is not automatically and immediately disastrous is shown by the Netherlands East Indies. The Japanese began by threatening all sorts of terrible things unless the NEI signed the trade agreement at once; but the Dutch stood firm and thus far the Japanese have done nothing except to order their delegation home.

The policy of the United States in a great world crisis is not a matter to be approached lightly or frivolously. We do not doubt that President Roosevelt and the men in the State Department on whom the responsibility rests have searched their hearts anxiously. There are grave risks whatever we do, or leave undone.

The policy toward Japan can, however, be approached historically. While we recognize that the President shares the responsibility, we believe that the major burden of decision lies with the men in the State Department, who recommend courses of action to him and, in theory, have carefully weighed all the facts on all sides. The men who make the decisions today are not new to their task; they have been there for years and they have tried an appeasement policy before. How has it worked?

One example was the attempt to keep Italy out of the war by sending her large shipments of American oil, steel and other material. The State Department seemed confident that if we bribed Il Duce enough he would remain neutral. Yet the fact is that the moment Mussolini decided France was done for, he came in. The State Department policy was 100-percent wrong.

Another conspicuous example was the attitude toward Spain during the civil war. State Department policy was nominally neutral but in fact excessively pro-Franco. We doubt that there is a single intelligent student of affairs in the democratic world who does not now recognize that this attitude was a monstrous, an almost fatal, mistake.

Again, since Germany and Italy put Franco upon his tottering seat of power, we have continued to try to bribe him with American food. When the protest became too loud, some pretty jugglery was proposed whereby we would lend money to the Argentine, which would then play the part of Santa Claus. Yet it should be obvious by now that Franco will enter the war the instant Hitler tells him to, and will in the meantime give the Nazis all possible aid and access.

We have similarly tried to buy off Vichy with shiploads of food. For the success of this policy, look at Syria.

A final point: there is solid evidence that some of the men in the State Department who have advised these successive disasters of appeasement have not come into court with clean hands. Some of them are by their own profound convictions pro-Nazi or pro-Fascist. Some of them have been charged, with formidable evidence, of anti-Semitism, of deliberately making more difficult the removal of refugees from Europe. It is hard to see how such men can weigh the question of appeasement in a new quarter of the world, such as Japan, with open minds.

It is quite true that we are in danger of being forced to fight in two oceans when we are prepared to fight in only one. But we do not make that danger any less menacing by exhibiting to the world a lively fear of our situation. Moreover, we *can* fight in two oceans as long as the British navy is available to help us in one of them. The real danger will come if we let the British go down and face the totalitarian world alone.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

If anything is certain it is that Japan will seize the Dutch East Indies the very moment she dares. The more we help her war machine, the sooner that day is likely to come. Appeasement will defeat its own ends just as it has in every other part of the world.

The most powerful deterrent to Japan is a strong China waging war vigorously with materials from the British and Americans, plus the aid which Stalin, in spite of everything, apparently intends to continue. As Ernest Hemingway has pointed out in his current series of articles in PM, the cost of one battleship given to China in the form of aid to her aviation and her other war efforts could end all thought of a Japanese thrust southward for a long time.

If Washington cannot muster up the courage to cut off supplies to Japan at once and unilaterally, it could certainly move in that direction. It would be easy to embargo all exports of essentials on the ground of the national emergency and then find a loophole to continue aid to the democracies. Such a formula would help save Japan's face, which is important. It would be better if shipments stopped tomorrow; but failing this, they could be tapered off to end in three months' time. It is really too ridiculous to send Japan 1,500,000 barrels of oil a month, as we are doing now, and then to threaten Americans with gasolineless Sundays and with cold homes next winter.

We doubt the value of an appeal to the appeasement group in the State Department; but after all, the final authority is the President. We urge him again to accept the profound truth that democracy is indivisible; that to betray it anywhere is to betray it everywhere; and that when you set a future date to begin to live up to your principles, it is notice to the world that you will never live up to them.

The Nazi-Soviet Enigma

ANOTHER MYSTERY is banking Eastern Europe with fog as reports accumulate that German troops in great numbers, augmented by Rumanians, Hungarians, and possibly Finns, are concentrating all along the Soviet frontier from the Arctic to the Black Sea. Meanwhile the Red Army is mobilized for extensive maneuvers. Correspondents and travelers from the border countries forecast a Nazi assault within a few days.

All this happens just after observers in this country and Britain have given up the last faint glimmer of hope that Stalin would, in self-preservation, join the war on the side of the Allies. On the face of events, the predictions of a Nazi-Soviet war are incredible. If Stalin were going to resist critical demands, why did he not do so when Germany was busy with Yugoslavia and Greece, and bring Turkey along with him? Why did he not block the Germans' access to the Dardanelles and the Black Sea?

And if the German strategists were assured by Stalin's inaction then, why all their display of power now? If, on the other hand, they still feel some doubt as to their ability to get whatever they may ultimately want from the Moscow dictator, why should they choose to attack Russia while they are still busy with Britain, and the United States is just over the horizon? It has been Hitler's rule to take on only one major foe at a time. He will have plenty of opportunity to finish with the Soviet Union after he has disposed of his other enemies—if he can. If he thinks that task will still be a difficult job, it would seem folly to court deliberately the much dreaded war on two fronts.

On the basis of these doubts and the general reluctance to indulge in any more wishful thinking about Nazi-Soviet relationships, other hypotheses have been suggested to account for the well advertised threat. One, appearing some weeks ago, is that Hitler is trying to make Britain and the United States believe that they can buy a secure peace by letting Hitler proceed with his old dream of extending his empire into the Ukraine. Rudolf Hess was reported to have landed with some such offer. The present disposition of the German troops might be a diplomatic move to reënforce a peace effort of this kind. Or it might be a mere propaganda bluff to cause us to slacken our efforts. Finally, it might be a military feint to catch the British off their guard, preparatory to an invasion after a lightning switch from east to west.

We profess no inside information or any knowledge of the mind of either dictator. The caution about believing that any serious trouble threatens on the Soviet border seems to us reasonable. Yet the unexpected is always possible, especially in this war—nothing could be more startling than the original shift of these two men when they first reached an understanding. It is conceivable that Hitler now intends to exact concessions from Stalin that the latter is extremely reluctant to grant. He may want not only a road through the Caucasus to the Middle East, but the Ukraine as a granary and source of oil, and command of Russian transportation and production. He may want Stalin as a full Axis partner. And he may intend to fight for these concessions if they are not gained. He may believe that he could crush the Soviet forces before his armies are needed elsewhere, that the time is now as favorable as any to realize his old ambition. The British could not now create a land front in the West. The Soviet army will be stronger than it is. Hitler would be invulnerable for years to come. He may anticipate serious shortages of which we know little. A conquered Russia might be twice as useful as a conquered France.

Let us suppose that, for some such set of reasons, the present threat is genuine. (If it is not so now, it may well be at some time in the future.) How then does Stalin's appeasement gamble appear? Was it so smart

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

after all to make a deal with Hitler in order to gain territory in Poland, Finland, the Baltic States and Rumania? Of what use are the rectifications of strategic frontiers? For, if Hitler's threat is real, Stalin must either surrender far more than he has gained, or fight after France and all the rest of the long list of conquered nations are no longer able to help him by offering resistance in their own behalf. Whether or not the German war dictator strikes now, Stalin has allowed him to choose his own time. That is the terrible risk incurred by any government which thinks to buy peace or any other concession from Herr Hitler. With him the only possible method of successful dealing is implacable hostility until his power is destroyed.

The New Lincoln

SOMEWHERE, sometime, there is sure to emerge a new national leader . . . the field of possibilities is unpredictable and unlimited. Nobody would have picked rough Lincoln as a remote possibility in the frontier state of Illinois—even as late as 1858."

So wrote Hugh Johnson in a recent column.

Who is the new Lincoln who will rise to save the Republic? According to Johnson, he may be Governor Leon Phillips of Oklahoma, "a sort of local hero of all parties." Phillips apparently cast his spell over Johnson when they spoke from the same platform on "I Am an American" Day in Tulsa a few weeks ago. On that day the new Lincoln delivered a labor-baiting, strikebreaking tirade so wild that even Johnson seemed unable to stomach it at the time.

But now Johnson has fallen with a thud for the man who may be the "new messiah"; he even finds a physical likeness between the gaunt Lincoln and his oversized successor. "Like Lincoln," Johnson says of Phillips, "he always looks as though he had slept in his clothes." We hate to dismiss lightly this important likeness, but even if Phillips slept in a frock coat and stovepipe hat we believe that it would still be a poor disguise for one of the most reactionary politicians in America.

Phillips, says Johnson, "has guts enough to believe in state economy." He certainly believes in it. When he took office he slashed all school budgets in Oklahoma in order to reduce the taxes of the wealthy oil and utility interests which elected him.

Johnson adds that Phillips has "a record of complete honesty in public office." As president of the Phillips Petroleum Company, Phillips twice went through bankruptcy proceedings and emerged under something of a cloud.

Johnson says that Phillips also believes in "decentralization of national and even state authority." Certainly. When the government tried to enforce its oil-conservation program in Oklahoma, Phillips attempted to place Oklahoma in a state of siege—the conservation program would have reduced the profits of the oil companies. In 1939 Phillips actually called out the militia to seize the PWA's power projects on the Red and the Grand Rivers to prevent them from being finished. These projects would have brought much needed power to Oklahoma's farmers, but utility rates would have been forced down.

Johnson was modest enough not to compare the labor records of the new Lincoln and his predecessor. Lincoln thanked God that he was able to live in a country in which workers could strike; but when the workers of the Mid-Continent factory at Tulsa struck in 1939, Phillips called out the militia to break the strike. In fact Phillips' main activity in his four years as Oklahoma's Governor seems to have been calling out the militia.

"He has never fudged a public obligation," says Hugh Johnson of Phillips. He has hardly ever faced one. Certainly one public obligation of a governor is to enforce civil rights. But under Phillips, Oklahoma has had one of the blackest records of any state for violation of civil rights. The last case in this record of violations was the dismissal of Dr. Maurice Halperin of the University of Oklahoma for his progressive views.

Is this "the American Creed" which Johnson says Phillips has carried out "to the letter"?

Everything is not going to be easy for the new Lincoln. "Governor Phillips," so Johnson warns, "is earthy and of the old American stock. If that among our alien influences is a handicap he has it." We are not sure what this means, but it sounds like another of the suggestions of anti-Semitism that many people felt Johnson had exuded last summer. If so, we know no reason to feel that Governor Phillips would object.

"I am not picking Governor Phillips for anything, but I advise keeping an eye on him," Johnson concludes. That was what he said about Willkie. For that choice he describes himself now as "an expert lemon picker." Today he is no longer even expert. But if he is to go on searching for new Lincolns we advise him to stick to lemons.

THE NEW REPUBLIC

A Journal of Opinion

Editors: BRUCE BLIVEN, MALCOLM COWLEY, GEORGE SOULE, STARK YOUNG; *Washington Editor:* MICHAEL STRAIGHT; *Treasurer:* DANIEL MEBANE; *Assistant Editors:* NIGEL DENNIS, BYRON DEXTER, OTIS FERGUSON, ELIZABETH HULING; *Contributing Editors:* H. N. BRAILSFORD, VAN WYCK BROOKS, JULIAN HUXLEY, MAX LERNER, E. C. LINDEMAN, R. G. TUGWELL; *Advertising Manager:* E. G. WOOD

SINGLE COPIES, FIFTEEN CENTS; YEARLY SUBSCRIPTION, FIVE DOLLARS; CANADIAN SUBSCRIPTION, SIX DOLLARS; FOREIGN, SIX DOLLARS; THREE MONTHS' TRIAL, ONE DOLLAR

EDITED AND PRODUCED UNDER UNION CONDITIONS BY CONTRACT WITH THE BOOK AND MAGAZINE GUILD, LOCAL 18, UOPWA, CIO

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Will Conscripted Labor Work?

FOR THE USE OF TROOPS by the President, in the strike at the North American airplane factory, only the most general warning was given. The justification for this action was supposed to lie in the desperate urgency of delivering planes to Britain. Yet it seems certain that Britain will receive fewer planes because of this action. For, as Philip Murray has said, "it can only serve to create a state of enforced labor in this nation and enforced labor can only create bitterness on the part of working people." Recently Isador Lubin described the tremendous losses suffered through slowdowns caused by a sense of injustice among defense workers. It is reported that the decline in aircraft production last month was due in part to a slowdown, and this slowdown will inevitably grow worse as the result of the way in which the Inglewood strike was broken.

There was no advance notice at all for General Hershey's order to local draft boards to reconsider the status of striking workers. No distinction is made in this order between strikes that are called in strict observance of federal legislation and those that are not. Officials of the Department of Labor and the National Labor Relations Board with whom I have spoken cannot believe that the President will allow this order to remain in force.

Full warning was given by the conservatives in Congress that they would seize upon any opportunity to make permanent, in effect, any losses suffered by labor. On the day that the Inglewood strike was broken, two amendments were passed in the House of Representatives to the new ten-billion-dollar appropriation bill. The first, the Chase amendment, forbids the payment of any part of the appropriation to any worker in a vital defense factory who pickets during a strike. The second, the Pace amendment, forbids payment from the appropriation to any person who shall "for as long as ten days fail, or refuse to accept and abide by a recommendation of the National Defense Mediation Board." In both of these amendments the employer is bound to dismiss any employee suspected of legitimate organizing activities which may lead to violations of the amendments. Both hand to the employers the most terrible weapon which they could possess, a nationwide blacklist sanctioned by Congress and used to hound disobedient defense workers from city to city and from job to job. Both amendments were headed for defeat when John McCormack, the majority leader, announced his support of the Chase amendment. It passed, and led to the passage of the Pace amendment after only ten minutes of debate. These amendments, and the Connolly amendment to the selective-service law, which is equally drastic, will probably be strengthened rather than modified in their final form. They may be further strengthened by the passage, with administration support, of a modified version of the Vinson bill.

A further outcome of the Inglewood strike may be the outlawing of the Communist Party. The Attorney General, Representative McCormack, Sidney Hillman and Secretaries Knox and Stimson all blamed the Communist Party for the strike. The Department of Justice is said to be preparing the necessary legislation.

The background for all of these actions lies simply in the aircraft organizing drives of the AFL and the CIO. Already the aircraft industry has 220,000 workers, young and easy to organize. Profits in the industry are sky high and the workers know it. North American, for instance, earned a rate of profit in 1940 equivalent to 57 percent of its net worth. Yet the average minimum wage in the industry is only 53 cents an hour. At North American the minimum is only 50 cents an hour, or about $1,950 a year on the basis of ten hours' overtime a week. This is $151 less than the "minimum health and decency" budget of the Department of Labor for skilled workers. Each day this minimum becomes more inadequate. The Bureau of Labor Statistics estimates that between October, 1939, and January, 1941, rents in San Diego rose by 21 percent.

A great deal of emphasis has been placed upon the Communist leadership of the CIO local at Inglewood. Very little has been said about the fact that the labor policies of the West Coast aircraft companies make moderation in union leadership impossible. In 1939 the La Follette Investigating Committee found that West Coast employers were using boycotts, labor spies, violence and vigilantism in their resistance to unionization. At the head of these employers the Committee found the aircraft companies.

In 1937 the aircraft companies formed an Aircraft Committee of the Merchants' and Manufacturers' Association to meet the threat of a union drive. The chairman of the Committee was J. H. Kindelberger, president of North American. The Aircraft Committee kept a complete blacklist of union sympathizers. It maintained a close liaison with the Los Angeles Police Department and Employment Bureau to prevent the hiring of union men. Through its intimate connection with the Bodell Detective Agency, the Committee was able to hire labor spies and strike-guards for its members at "actual cost," saving more than two dollars per man each day. The importance of this concession may be seen in the Douglas Aircraft Company's bill of $9,200 for six days in March, 1938.

The Aircraft Committee also determined the level of wages in the industry. Minimum wages were held

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

down by concerted action, and though top wage rates were high, few workers ever earned them. Temporary shutdowns in production caused layoffs, and when the men returned to work they were rehired at starting rates. If an employee decided to move from one company to another, he was of course given a letter of recommendation. When he presented the letter he would be offered a job at the exact rate of pay he had given up. He never knew why, but the explanation was simple: the letter contained this code:

OUR PAYMENT
0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

At the lower left-hand corner of the letter the initials of the writer and stenographer would appear. They might be, say, BK:MP. The first initials meant nothing; the second read "our payment, 63 cents an hour."

The aircraft companies kept a strict watch on new entrants into the industry. This they did by controlling the training schools through which these workers must pass. When the NYA undertook to train workers it was forced to refuse Negroes and Jews. The companies, led by Donald Douglas, would not employ them.

A strike against one aircraft company became in effect a strike against all the companies. When the CIO struck at Vultee, Vultee's president told The Los Angeles Times that "we have been told that this is not a strike against Vultee but against the aircraft industry." In breaking strikes the aircraft companies made use not only of detective agencies but also of outside organizations such as the Neutral Thousands, an industry-financed group which started back-to-work movements among the strikers' wives. This group distributed leaflets appealing "on behalf of the wives and little children of the men forced out on strike."

These facts form an essential background to an understanding of the Inglewood strike. Early in March, the UAW of the CIO defeated the Machinists of the AFL by seventy votes in a Labor Board election at the Inglewood Plant. The UAW won the election on its assurance that the first union contract would include a 75-cent minimum wage and an overall wage increase of 10 cents an hour. This assurance was not unreasonable in the light of the company's profits and the 85-cent minimum at the nearby General Motors plant. But from March until May the union attempted to obtain a contract with no success. A strike was then called for May 27.

On May 22 the representatives of the company and the union were called before the Mediation Board. They met with the secretary of the Board, and a compromise was reached by which the company agreed to make any wage settlement retroactive to May 1, and the union leaders agreed not to call a strike until three days after the Board had failed to find a settlement. But on Monday, Tuesday and Wednesday of the following week, meetings were held at which neither side moved an inch in the vital wage issue. On Wednesday night the union leaders faced a second strike deadline. They broke the agreement and called the strike.

Of course the strike was a mistake. The Mediation Board could not have granted a minimum wage lower than the 62.5 cents recommended in the case of the Brewster Aeronautical Corporation. The choice of May 1 as the date to which a settlement of wages was to be made retroactive was an unprecedented victory for the union and should have removed the strike pressure. The union leaders, however, distrusted the Mediation Board and engendered a similar distrust among the union members. On the record of the Board there was no basis for this distrust, which was an important factor in precipitating the strike. To this extent the Communist leadership did cause the strike. This is a grave responsibility, but it is no graver than the responsibility of North American, whose stubborn refusal to reach a reasonable settlement was equally important.

The strike was unnecessary, but there was no justification for Attorney General Jackson's wild charge that it "more nearly resembles an insurrection than a labor strike." It was unfortunate, but it did not demand the punishment, by Congress, of the entire labor movement.

Now that the strike has been broken, the outlines of the government's new labor policy are already becoming clear. It seems probable that basic wage standards will be determined for defense industries in conferences among government, labor and the employers, and that the employers and the unions will enter into two-year contracts to observe these agreements without recourse to strikes or lockouts. Wages will then be adjusted to meet changes in the cost of living. This is the form of agreement already enforced in the shipbuilding industry by Morris Cooke's Shipbuilding Stabilization Committee. When disputes arise in defense industries they will be referred to the Mediation Board on condition that there shall be no strikes or lockouts while the case is before the Board. If the Board makes a recommendation upon the case, nonobservance of the recommendation will mean commandeering in the case of the employers and army service or blacklisting for employees. This means, of course, compulsory arbitration. In this sense the Mediation Board is following the development of the old War Labor Board, which had less power, but whose recommendations were enforced by President Wilson.

This move to make the recommendations of the Mediation Board compulsory in effect began when the Board first met on March 27. The Board itself regards it as disastrous. Murray and William H. Davis, the Board's most experienced member, have both publicly opposed it. Davis feels that the Board's strength lies in its ability to reach agreements and that agreement becomes more difficult if either side knows that force may eventually be used. So far the Board

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

has settled thirty-four disputes, and in only four of these have recommendations been made. The Board prefers to think of the case of the Minneapolis Moline Power Implement Company, in which the company and the CIO were called from Minneapolis to Washington six hours before a strike was due to begin. Both sides traveled on the same train, and played poker most of the way. When they reached Washington late at night, only the form of the settlement remained to be agreed on.

This can no longer happen. Between the attempt to obtain the agreement of the two parties to a dispute, and the declaration of conditions under which work will be enforced by bayonets, there is a lonely road for any labor man to tread.

It is necessary, finally, to ask: What is to be done?

I think that it should be recognized that many unwarranted actions were taken in the white heat of last week which should now be reconsidered. The Hershey order should be totally rescinded. Full hearings should be held by the appropriate House and Senate committees before the final passage of the labor-breaking legislation which has been introduced. There should be no further assault on the civil rights of any group until full and open evidence is offered proving that the group is engaged in organized sabotage. If labor is to be forbidden the right to strike, an immediate attack must be made upon the causes of strikes: on non-union employers who violate federal legislation; on the lack of representation, which results in the lack of responsibility; on war profiteering which inflames labor's sense of injustice; on rising prices which threaten the lives and homes of union men.

This crisis is as demanding in its loyalties and as heartless in the division which it creates as the crisis of Tom Paine's time. "He who stands against it now deserves the love and thanks of all men and women."

Washington MICHAEL STRAIGHT

Texas Kingfish

SUN-BITTEN TEXANS, who have weathered political campaigns of many sorts, are being given a third opportunity to vote for hill-billy music, the Ten Commandments and mother love. These items still form the main political stock of Wilbert Lee O'Daniel, the dimpled flour salesman who began his second two-year term as Governor last January and is now reaching for the senatorial toga of the late Morris Sheppard. The choice will be made at a special election June 28.

With his opposition split among twenty-six other candidates and with sample polls showing him in the lead, O'Daniel seems headed for Washington to claim the seat filled temporarily by Andrew Jackson Houston, aged son of the hero of San Jacinto. Only a plurality is needed to win. O'Daniel's late entry into the race has taken most of the wind out of the other candidates. The Governor's real opposition is divided by Representatives Lyndon Johnson and Martin Dies and Texas' young but able attorney general, Gerald Mann, who probably would have won the race if O'Daniel had stayed out and who is still given a fighting chance.

The O'Daniel technique has changed little since his initial campaign three years ago. He was then a newcomer to politics and was ineligible to vote because he had failed to pay his poll tax. But he had built up a big radio following with the aid of the hill-billy musicians he used in selling flour. His Mother's Day speech brought enough tears to flood the Rio Grande. His main plank, other than support of the Ten Commandments and the Golden Rule, was bigger pensions for the old folks.

When he added to mother love such sure-fire ingredients as old-time religion and hill-billy music, he had an irresistible appeal for those who are suspicious of intelligence in high places and who habitually switch off Toscanini to get "Home on the Range." With his hill-billy band, he made a 100,000-mile stumping tour, in which he combined the techniques of Billy Sunday and Billy Rose. His audiences were bigger than those of his dozen opponents combined. He promised $30 a month to every Texan of sixty-five or older, whether he needed it or not. When anyone asked where he would get this money, he invariably turned to his musicians and called, "Strike up a tune, boys." The slogan voiced by his hill-billies was "Pass the biscuits, Pappy," but he never failed to pass the hat at a political meeting. When the campaign was over and all expenses were paid, he had $801.30 left to give to the Red Cross.

O'Daniel's showmanship and his pension promises brought out to the polls thousands who hadn't voted since 1928, when they joined the moral crusade to keep Al Smith from desecrating the White House. Many voting places were swamped and had to stay open until late at night to accommodate the waiting lines. In appealing to the old folks, O'Daniel had a strong advantage in the Texas law that requires a $1.75 poll-tax receipt as a prerequisite for voting but exempts from this requirement all those past sixty-five.

Apparently few voters were influenced by the effort to pin a carpetbagger label on O'Daniel. Born in Ohio in 1890, he was taken to Kansas five years later. There he grew up on his stepfather's farm and attended high school for two years and business college for one. He entered the flour-milling business as a bookkeeper and soon became a sales manager. The only milling com-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

pany he headed was taken over by a larger firm that later went into receivership in the post-war farm deflation, and stockholders lost their investments.

In the First World War, O'Daniel's most conspicuous service to his country was in painting his automobile red, white and blue and driving it in patriotic parades. He was known as Wilbert O'Daniel until he came South about two decades ago. At that time he suddenly uncovered a middle name and became W. Lee O'Daniel. He arrived in Fort Worth in 1925 to become sales manager for a milling company. For two years, beginning in 1933, he was president of the Fort Worth Chamber of Commerce.

A. THINN

O'Daniel's first term as Governor was a failure from almost every point of view. Some of his appointments were better than his critics had anticipated; but his unfamiliarity with governmental and economic problems handicapped him at every turn, and his legislative program bogged down. He promised bigger checks to the aged, but these were smaller at the close of his term than at the beginning. He promised economy, but signed bigger appropriations than ever. He promised to abolish that iniquitous means of disfranchisement, the poll tax, but failed to turn a hand toward this end. He opposed a sales tax in his campaign, but promptly faced about and tried to ram down the legislature's throat one of the most oppressive sales taxes ever devised.

In spite of all this, O'Daniel refused last year to return to his flour peddling. He blamed a recalcitrant legislature for the breakdown of his nebulous program and asked reëlection as a vindication. Slapped by the Texas daily press, he issued for a time his own weekly paper. Refused free time by the leading Texas radio stations, he resorted to a powerful Mexican station located just beyond the Rio Grande and free from United States regulations affecting misrepresentation and libel.

The old folks apparently believed that O'Daniel was a martyr to legislative perfidy, for he was renominated by a bigger majority than before and consequently was reëlected. In his second term, he again advocated a heavy sales tax to finance old-age assistance and again was rebuffed. The legislature did pass an omnibus tax bill that will make old-age-assistance checks; but, in harmony with federal regulations affecting grants-in-aid, these doles will continue to go only to those shown to be in need, not to all the aged as promised by O'Daniel.

In his campaign for the Senate, O'Daniel cannot toss off as easily as before the opposition of organized labor, a small but growing force in Texas. Three years ago, he answered labor questions by relating tearfully that his father was buried in overalls. But recently he sponsored a restrictive labor law and sought new industries for Texas in a letter that seemed to promise that employers in Texas could provide whatever wages and working conditions they saw fit and that any obstreperous workers who sought to better their condition by means accepted in other states would be put to work picking cotton on Texas prison farms.

Another O'Daniel handicap this year is his failure to resign the governorship, or at least to forgo his gubernatorial salary while campaigning for the Senate. This would not have been an issue except that O'Daniel himself, shortly before Senator Sheppard's death, urged enactment of a law to ban any state official from running for another state office—except to succeed himself—without first resigning the one he held. In this proposal, O'Daniel may have had in mind crippling the attorney general or some member of the railroad commission who might have opposed him for a third term in 1942. But while, technically, the law he sought would not have applied to the current campaign, his present course is inconsistent with his recent proposal. Mann, a former All-American quarterback of Southern Methodist University with a law degree from Harvard, is in a position to make the most of this, since he—alone of the twenty-seven candidates—is giving up his salary while campaigning.

Yet neither his labor-baiting nor his inconsistency is likely to count for much with those for whom hillbilly music and circus antics are the chief ingredients of a political campaign. Though a dud as a public servant, O'Daniel knows how to get into office. At fifty-one, he could teach Phineas Barnum a whole pack of tricks. He looks younger than he is, and many of the ladies like his dimples and his dapper clothes. Taller than average, he has black hair, brown eyes and not quite enough chin. He grins disarmingly at his audiences and talks with a slow drawl. He still seems a bit bewildered in the complex world of politics into which circumstances have tossed him.

Entering the senatorial campaign late, O'Daniel has begun by making his customary noise without raising any real issues. Apparently he is depending mainly on the divided opposition and the continued support of the old folks to send him to Washington. Support by the old people will count for more than usual this year. Since no attempt is made to collect the Texas poll tax except as a prerequisite for voting, many pay it only in the regular election years. Thus thousands, not expecting an important election this year, failed to pay this tax before the January 31 deadline, which came before Senator Sheppard's death. This circumstance leaves a

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

larger proportion of the total vote than usual in the hands of those past sixty-five.

Some of O'Daniel's present support, particularly in the legislature, comes from those who want to get him out of the Governor's office at any cost. If he does no better as Senator than as Governor, this may prove a serious mistake for both Texas and the nation. But if, in some ways, he is no better qualified for the Senate than Louisiana's late Kingfish, he at least has been free from the graft and gangsterism that marked Huey Long's rise to power. More voluble than literate, O'Daniel is the dubious messiah of rainbow-chasers in a state that has lived under six flags and a flour sack.

Dallas WAYNE GARD

Why Britain Has No Labor Problem

BEFORE discussing the precise lessons that we can learn from Great Britain's experience with labor in wartime it is necessary to understand the basic differences between the British and American labor movements. *The first of these is that the workers of Britain are more completely unionized* than are those of the United States. Although England has an industrial population only one-third as large as that of this country, there are 6,234,000 members of British trade unions—nearly as many as are in the AFL and the CIO combined. Most of the unions are integrated into one common organization, the Trades Union Congress. There has been no split within the ranks of labor caused by two factions, each more anxious to checkmate the other than to unite in common strength. Industrial unionism along the CIO line is more advanced in Britain than in the United States. Ernest Bevin's Transport and General Workers' Union, formed by amalgamating thirty-six once independent unions, has a membership of more than one million—nearly one-sixth of all organized labor. In the engineering and shipbuilding trades—two key armament fields—there are only two principal labor organizations. There have been no jurisdictional strikes.

But the most important difference between the labor movements of the two countries is that collective bargaining has been universally accepted in England as an essential condition of healthy industrial relations. Organized associations of trade unions are recognized and dealt with by organized associations of employers. British industrialists are not more tolerant than Americans, but they are more mature. Britain years ago passed through her disruptive period of labor organization. The fear of labor as a subversive class has given way to the practical necessity of admitting labor's right to organize and to be treated as a respected element in the industrial community. Except for the Transport Workers' strike of 1937, Britain has not been troubled in recent years by organizational strikes such as have plagued the United States in the Ford, Bethlehem, Vultee and North American disputes. British employers have found that recognition of collective bargaining has made labor both responsible and conservative.

This does not mean that there have been no strikes in British industry. There have been, but usually they are of brief duration because they involve issues that can be more easily compromised than class hatreds. In June, 1939, a typical prosperity month, there were eighty-one strikes. Of these, forty-one concerned rates of pay, two dealt with hours of work and twenty-five related to the employment of certain types of labor. Only six strikes (seven percent) were in any way related to trade-union principles, and in these cases it was only the detail and not the principle of collective bargaining that was at stake.

In the first few months of the war there were five important strikes in aircraft factories which involved nearly twelve thousand persons. Four of these disputes related to demands for wage increases and in no case were of more than four days' duration; in two instances they lasted only one and two days. In the fifth case, nearly twelve hundred workers struck for four days to enforce their demand to stop work in mid-afternoon to make tea. A compromise was reached when the management agreed to send tea tables around to the assembly lines. Shades of Karl Marx!

The first lesson for Americans is that industrial peace will best be achieved by more collective bargaining rather than less. This country should be thankful that in the last two decades we have moved away from our past tradition of bitter struggle between labor and capital wherein each side viewed the other as its class enemy. With the more general acceptance of the principle of the National Labor Relations Board which guarantees labor's right to organize, the demand of labor to be recognized as socially respectable has been granted. The CIO's organizing strikes of 1936-37 were beneficial, for they established the practice of collective bargaining in large sections of heavy industry. It is notable that the most intractable strikes in America in recent months have occurred in those plants with a long history of labor trouble and mutual distrust on the part of both employers and employees.

An important lesson to be learned from Britain's labor experience is that the goodwill and zealous cooperation of the workers must not be alienated by scornful or violent policies of the government. As in no previous war, this is labor's battle. One of the basic issues at stake is whether the freedom of men to organize for the improvement of their conditions of life shall

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

perish from the earth. British labor knows this. It was organized labor in England which raised the banner in the fight against fascism, but it was the error of the Chamberlain government to lose the support of the workers just when it was crucially needed. For years the British labor movement, through the Trades Union Congress and the parliamentary Labor Party, proclaimed its enmity to Nazism. But Neville Chamberlain's appeasement policy convinced English labor that the Conservative Cabinet was in effect the Foreign Office of the German Chancellery.

The workers' distrust was intensified by Chamberlain's preference for industrialists and indifference to labor during the rearmament period. The British Federation of Industries and other employer associations were frequently consulted by the government. The unions were either ignored or peremptorily summoned to 10 Downing Street, where, in a few chill words, the Prime Minister would tell them "to get on with the job." The Cabinet's policy was to grant huge defense contracts to a few large firms and hope for the best. The workers in the trade unions were driven to a cynical hatred of a government so stupid, stolid and incapable of democratic leadership.

Winston Churchill called on labor men to head key economic ministries, not because labor has a monopoly of leadership, but because it was necessary to restore labor's alienated confidence in the government. British victory depended on British production, and it was organized labor in the armament plants that would have to make the greatest physical sacrifices of "sweat and toil." In the catastrophic weeks of Flanders, Dunkirk and Paris it may have been the salvation of England that British labor was organized so that responsible labor leaders could deal with the government and accept new duties on behalf of millions of individual workers. Labor responded to the Cabinet's appeal and the armament factories worked eleven to twelve-hour shifts, twenty-four hours a day, seven days a week. The job of accelerating war production would have proved administratively impossible were it not for the fact that British labor's significance in industry was long accepted by British industrialists, if not by the Chamberlain government. The tradition of collaboration between employers and employees was established, collective bargaining and pacific settlement of disputes were taken for granted.

Organized labor in Britain has been as anxious as organized business to protect its special interests. As industrialists have insisted on cost-plus contracts, "reasonable profits" and amortization of new plant, so unionists have demanded higher wages, pay and a half for overtime and government guarantees to restore prewar working conditions. This lesson does not deny the importance of management, but it does assert the equal importance of labor. We must admit this reality—that in total war production in a democracy, organized labor has the talents and the economic importance to contribute as a full partner to the defense effort.

The average citizen realizes the importance of war production and sees that strikes impede it. In typical American fashion he concludes that the government "should pass a law against 'em." This obvious decision is bolstered when he hears that Britain has "outlawed" strikes. It is true that the British government has done this. But mere prohibition has not prevented their occurrence, even during the war. In the four years 1936-39 there was an average of 940 strikes a year in Great Britain. After the war broke out, labor disputes continued, and during the first five months of 1940 occurred frequently—seventy to ninety a month. Though there were (on the average) more than 100,000 to 150,000 workdays lost per month, the Chamberlain Conservatives dared not further antagonize labor by prohibiting such production stoppages.

Soon after the Churchill Cabinet came to power in May, 1940, Ernest Bevin, as Minister of Labor, called on a subcommittee of the National Joint Advisory Council, attached to the Ministry of Labor, to suggest policies for the elimination of labor disputes. In June this committee, on which the Trades Union Congress was represented, made certain unanimous recommendations. First, during the war emergency: "It is imperative that there should be no stoppage of work owing to trade disputes." Second, the existing trade councils in each industry, representing labor, management and the public, should continue to settle any disagreements which might arise between employers and employees concerning wages, hours or conditions of work. Third, only in case these industry boards failed to reach a solution acceptable to the parties concerned should the dispute be referred to a national arbitration council whose decision would be binding on all parties.

In July, 1940, Minister of Labor Bevin issued a special order to give effect to these unanimous proposals. Strikes were legally banned. Authoritative machinery was established to settle disputes. And the minimum standard of work in union shops was made the standard for all firms in the industry, whether or not they recognized trade unions.

But strikes have occurred about as frequently as before they were forbidden. The monthly average of the pre-war years 1936-39 was seventy-eight. During May, 1940, with the Norway fiasco, the Cabinet crisis and the Battle of Flanders, they numbered ninety-two. During June, the collapse of France and the imminent threat of invasion called for intensified production. In most cases the workers voluntarily suspended strikes. In that month the number of disputes dropped to thirty and workdays lost to fourteen thousand; one-third and one-seventh of the respective totals for May. Curiously, in July, the very month when strikes were outlawed, the total began to mount month by month

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

until by October it reached ninety-one—greater than for any month in 1939. But the number of workers involved and workdays lost was much lower than in pre-Flanders months. Disputes were affecting smaller numbers of persons and were settled more rapidly.

In most cases these strikes were motivated by desire for wage increases. This employers have been surprisingly willing to concede, inasmuch as the 100-percent excess-profits tax, cost-plus contracts and an inflationary price spiral have diminished the incentive to keep costs down. As a result the strikes have been settled quickly and very few of them have been referred to the National Arbitration Council—only three decisions were handed down by this tribunal in August. According to The London Economist, a few small disputes have been promoted by Communist saboteurs with the intent of obstructing the war effort. Nevertheless, it is significant that up to the beginning of 1941 there was no instance in which the government had enforced the law to punish strikers.

Why? Punitive action has dangerous boomerang possibilities. The punishment of a handful of irresponsible workers might be dramatized as a frontal attack by the government on the labor movement as a whole, resulting in sullen hostility. Such hostility might snowball into widespreading strikes which would seriously impair production even though the government eventually brought them under control. This is exactly what did happen in the World War. But more important for our instruction is the fact that the summary application of punishment fails to achieve the objective of a war economy—continuous production. In wartime, workers are needed in factories, not in jails. Their legitimate complaints must be acknowledged and satisfied. This calls for mediation, not prosecution.

To prohibit strikes does not prevent them. Drastic punishment attacks the symptom of labor trouble and not the cause. The only effective solution is to utilize the conciliation machinery of the government to settle labor-management grievances. Britain's industrial maturity has given her the advantages of an elaborate system of trade councils to resolve such disputes. But in the United States large sections of industry are unorganized and the establishment of such industrial councils as proposed by CIO's Philip Murray must await the further integration of both employers and employees. Some day we shall have them. Until then, the Department of Labor's Conciliation Division and the President's Mediation Board must handle the job.

It must be remembered that in England strikes were not outlawed by an impatient Parliament overriding the opposition of labor. In effect, the workers, acting through the Ministry of Labor's Advisory Council and Ernest Bevin, formulated and imposed the ban on themselves. As the British law has not yet been enforced, it is in fact merely a declaration of industrial policy.

In this country, such a statement of industrial policy might be made by the Mediation Board, the government agency which represents both labor and management. It should assert first, that the legitimate grievances of employers and employees will receive the sympathetic support of the government; second, that workers may form unions of their own choosing—and in plants not yet organized, for there is no valid reason why the principles of the National Labor Relations Board should be suspended just when their recognition is most essential for industrial compatibility. And I believe it is proper to ask, third, that both workers and employers recognize their obligation to the nation in the crisis and voluntarily agree not to precipitate lockouts or strikes for at least sixty days after a dispute has been referred to the Department of Labor or the Mediation Board.

More drastic action would be dangerous and stupid at the present time. At a point in industrial relations where the "rights" of those who work must be balanced against the "rights" of those who manage, genuine democrats must rely not on punishment but on machinery—greased with common sense.

WILLIAM STEELE MCCAULEY

Design for Summer

Boy, in possession of the perfect noon
and his own godlike will,
pauses by a hedge, permits sun's still
touch to occupy and dispose boy's will.
This is to abandon and retreat,
to worship world at perfection-pitch.
This is retirement. Time misses a beat.
Here is stilled boy, flowering hedge.
Here is time's hesitation at noon.

But soon
the eyes of retired and refreshed lord light
on green and golden wings in frenzy whirring
against a petal at his foot, stirring
intoxicant fragrance up. Quiet.
Shatter not the delicate bond which
holds time and new moth fast
against the flower. Stoop. Soft.
And now stretch forth the hand
to capture time and the frantic wings and
have their ecstasy with the fingertips.

Success. In the prison of cupped hands
the damp wings palpitate.
Boy stands still. Time starts again, moves away.
And now he learns the treachery of his will,
for he cannot get his hands apart.
No instruction issues from his brain.
He is imprisoned at his own command.
In vain his captured heart
beats and beats and beats against his hands.

JUDD POLK

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Americana

A GREAT NUMBER of Allston's jottings refer to American scenes and people. He had traveled widely through the country. He seems to have been seeking for what he might have called a rationale or philosophy of American life; but he could never feel that he had succeeded in getting his mind around the subject. "It is like trying to grasp," he remarks, "a planet in the making. A planet is a handful, at best; and, while the core of this planet is certainly solid, much of it is molten, and some of it steam." Elsewhere he quotes from a speech of Herbert Spencer's, delivered in New York in 1882: "Because of its size, and the heterogeneity of its components, the American nation will be a long time in evolving its ultimate form, but its ultimate form will be high."

Naturally, Allston's impressions are often conflicting, and his views are often momentary and partial. Moreover, he was touchy, or inclined to be so, when foreigners criticized the country. He quoted Edward Everett Hale's remark, "People who come from other countries and write about our affairs are apt to make mistakes." Sometimes he could not forgive them for making the sort of mistakes that his countrypeople also were prone to make. Thus, for example, he says:

Our French and English friends like to hear about the "American language," the "American rhythm," etc. They force themselves to see American traits in our writers and have no interest in them unless they can find these traits. They wish us to be as unlike themselves as possible, and I do not blame them for this; for naturally they are in search of new sensations. They would be happier still if we painted our faces red and wore feathers.

Do I mean that I wish Americans were French or English? I wish us to be what we are, whatever we are; I wish us to be the effects of our natural causes, as the first step to being something better. But I do not wish America to be a sideshow, in its own mind or the minds of others. Our French and English friends are entitled to their impressions, and, if they enjoy the "American rhythm," that is their affair. I know what they mean by the phrase. It certainly describes an American symptom, but I think it is a very bad symptom, related to St. Vitus' dance, and one which, I hope, is not organic. To encourage it seems to me criminal, and what I resent is not that our French and English friends enjoy it but that we perform to give them pleasure. Our "American rhythmists" remind me of the South Carolina pickaninnies who perform the Charleston along the roads because the Northern tourists throw them pennies. The real things of America have nothing in common with this rhythm, which is both superficial and psychopathic.

Other notes reveal the chip on the patriotic shoulder:

The United States is living in several stages of history at once. This is what foreign observers cannot seem to forgive. Dick Turpin and Jack Sheppard were popular heroes in England in 1750. Englishmen should understand our Pretty Boys and Dillingers. The Dayton, Tennessee, case echoed round the world. But how long ago was it that the greatest university in Spain prohibited the teaching of Sir Isaac Newton's theories?

In reality, at the present time, England, France and Spain are also living in all these stages. There are gangsters and gunmen in Marseilles as there are in Chicago, as numerous and as ferocious. The people of Brittany are behind the times in the matter of Evolution. So are the shepherds of the Shetland Islands. Then why does the world expect so much of the mountaineers of Tennessee? Why is the limelight turned on the Dayton case?—as upon the American gangsters and gunmen, while the gangsters of Marseilles go unobserved? All these anachronisms are visible with us, and for a good reason. It is because Americans think they ought to be well behaved, up-to-date and educated people, and because the world expects this of them; and the world is outraged when they are not and makes a great hue and cry about it. Who expects a Breton peasant to have correct ideas about Evolution? Who expects a Corsican bandit to behave like a civilized man? Our foreign friends who smile at us pay us a high tribute. They are judging us by our own American standard.

"America is an extraordinarily ghostless country." Thus my Irish friend—a lover of ghosts—who compares us with England and his country. He means that America has a great deal of exposed surface, and this is the novelty for Europeans. They are not interested in our nooks and crannies, where the ghosts abound, because these are too much like their own. They come here for new impressions, and our exposed surface gives them a dazzling array of these. Our "ghostlessness" is as striking to them as the ghostly is to Americans in Ireland and England. Nothing ever takes them to Poughkeepsie or Portsmouth or Charleston, or the pre-urban surroundings of the past generations. But Kipling found more of the ghostly in Vermont than he ever found in England because he spent three years there; and I fancy there are more ghosts in the South, between Savannah and Memphis, than there are in any similar area in Europe. From Hawthorne to Henry James, from Mary E. Wilkins to William Faulkner, our story-tellers' world has been peopled with ghosts.

I distrust Santayana's "Epicurean contentment" with a world run by cardinals and engineers. For is not this the moral of Mario van der Weyer, the hero of "The Last Puritan," his novel? I say the hero, for which is the hero, Oliver or this other young man to whom in his Epilogue Santayana says, "Any future worth having will spring from men like you"? Of course, Santayana never understood this country, and does not "The Last Puritan" tell us why?

Consider this picture of Emerson's house in Concord: "To feed Oliver's idealism they stopped on their way back at Concord. . . . They looked at the dreadful little house in which Emerson lived, and at his cold little sitting-room; and then they looked at each other. *Could such great things*

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

leave such mean traces?" Not a word about the moral beauty of this habitation, not to speak of its simple grace and charm—which left Emerson free to live in the mind. It was merely cold, little and dreadful.

Suppose one turned the tables and imagined the Italian thinkers in the Rome that Santayana likes so much. No doubt, their dwellings are of "white marble," like Santayana's talent, and one could not call these dreadful; but, in their world of cardinals and engineers, what has become of their freedom to live in the mind? Should we not be obliged to say fifty years hence, *Could such mean things leave such great traces?*

There is nothing about Emerson's house that I do not like. But one would expect a thinker to prefer the tub of Diogenes to the Rome of Santayana.

To follow this crescendo of patriotism:

Poor little Pirandello gives out a statement, on landing in New York, defending Mussolini's Ethiopian war with the analogy of our dealings with the American Indians. Astonishing how little these continentals know about the American mind. Of all the aspects of our history, except perhaps the Mexican war, the Indian aspect is the one that makes every decent American blush. And that is the best self-defense this Italian can think of.

It was not provincial, thirty years ago, for foreigners not to know what Americans think. It is provincial now, especially when Americans, with their uncensored press—uncensored, at least, by the government—know more about Italy than the Italians know, and more about Germany than the Germans.

But, while Allston was often touchy when foreigners criticized his country, he loved to chastise it himself, in this resembling the French and the Eskimos alike. He enjoyed nothing more than commenting on American foibles. For instance, he says:

I usually find Englishmen refreshing—S. D., W. M., H. L. S. and others—because they are invariably direct, unequivocal, outspoken. Beside their conversation, too much of our American conversation is indirect, overabounding in tact, equivocal, diplomatic, as if one were always having to consider people's feelings, always thinking twice, fearing to step on someone's toes. It is all circumlocution and beating about the bush. One would think Americans never knew where they stood. Englishmen almost always suggest veracity and courage; Americans too often suggest mendacity and fear. There is a long story behind these two attitudes. We are the victims of many circumstances which we have not mastered. One of these is the mixture of races which cannot meet without equivocation and are always putting forth tentacles to feel one another out. But it plays the devil with our minds.

Americans in general are no great shakes at conversation, and one of the reasons for this, I think, is that we are too sympathetic. All conversation among sympathetic people tends to adjust itself to the weakest link in the chain. If one person is self-conscious, they all tend to become self-conscious. If he has a woolly mind, the conversation becomes woolly. I have seen a whole table demoralized by one poor lamb whose secret wish was merely to be somewhere else.

Many men I know are so used to stupid people and bad conversation that they cannot conduct the real thing. One is always clearing out of the path of the talk the boulders of misconstruction with which the dull have been permitted to strew it. The primary meanings of words are the only meanings that no one takes for granted. Thus, when religion is mentioned one has to explain that one does not mean the Spanish Inquisition or the Baptists of Tennessee. This makes good talk impossible. Too many intelligent Americans are half-consciously in reaction all the time against the narrow conditions of their childhood, a fact that also explains the small-minded bitterness of many American novels. Good writers and good talkers take it for granted that they are living on Mount Olympus.

How generally uniform are American minds.

Percival Lowell, in "Chöson," speaks of an old Korean map-maker who left America out of his map of the world. But he mentioned some French sailors who were said to have seen it. "On reaching it, they found it to be one vast level wilderness. The only sounds of life which they heard in this great wilderness were the cries of some parrots in the distance."

I seem to remember hearing these cries myself.

I add a few other notes on American foibles :

Boston people are usually sure they are right, even when they are wrong. Western people are usually afraid they are wrong, even when they are right. That is why the West owns the future.

"Keep moving, keep moving!" So the guards tell us in the subway. As if Americans needed this advice! We have done nothing but "keep moving" since the year 1620. We have moved from Plymouth Rock to Connecticut, from Connecticut to Ohio, from Ohio to Wisconsin, from Wisconsin to Dakota, and from Dakota to California. Is it any wonder that, arriving in California, and having nowhere else to go, our countrymen have gone up in the air?

Much of the weakness of the American mind is due to our ingrained habit of taking our bases lightly and shifting them so easily—moving our habitations, resorting to divorce—instead of committing ourselves for good and all to one fixed base and set of relations. Our history is a kaleidoscope of creeds and no-creeds, and the habit of pioneering and changing homesteads—"tents of a day"—at every obstacle or at every prospect of better fortune elsewhere, the habit of the permanently transitory—all this has taken from us the stability of mind, the continuity of environment that one must have in order to produce great things. How familiar in my childhood was the sight of a dwelling, mounted on beams and uprooted from its original situation, in process of being dragged through the streets by a team of horses to better its position somewhere else. Half the streets of my childhood were periodically blocked by these foolish structures—sometimes even churches—endeavoring thus to get up in the world. The divorce-mania appeared on the scene after the moving-mania and somehow struck one as a consequence of it. The secret of living is not to shift one's base, in any respect whatever, except under a force of circumstances that amounts to a moral compulsion. Otherwise, life is bound to be a waste, shallow, trivial and unproductive.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

These Daughters of the American Revolution, with faces like angry stone walls—they will have to change their expressions if they wish to save the country.

For arrogance, look homeward, angel. For every race on the planet the vulgar American has an opprobrious epithet. It would take a Rabelais to exhaust the names he showers on his fellow beings—wops, dagoes, heinies, squareheads, frogs, sheenies, limies, chinks and dirty Irish. Commonly uttered in good humor, these names express a latent attitude which, under pressure, may yield in social relations only the deposit of contempt that easily turns into animosity. As with everything else in America, we see this in terms of fair weather. What will be the effect of a few good storms?

Beside the Chinese, we Americans are like spoiled children. Every now and then, for a bath of ethics and good manners, I visit the Chinese missionaries; for so I call the laundrymen who abound in our towns and villages.

VAN WYCK BROOKS

This is the eighth article in the series, "Opinions of Oliver Allston." – THE EDITORS

Wilderness Battleground

THE OPENING, two years ahead of schedule, of Grand Coulee Dam on March 22, was a dramatic reminder that not all federal money these days is going into airplanes and tanks and dreadnaughts. As President Roosevelt put it, Grand Coulee not only gave employment during one emergency, but will provide electric power in another—it is a timely demonstration that conservation of resources is a part of national defense. At a dozen scattered points in the Far West this phase of America's rearmament is proceeding at full speed. Floods and erosion and pollution are being checked, vast acreages watered and reclaimed, swift streams opened to navigation and huge amounts of hydro-electricity generated.

In mountain and desert fastnesses, towering dams are built nearly to their parapets. From them irrigation canals and steel transmission lines fan out like rays. River channels 500 miles away are deepened. Layers of slack water bury rapids and falls. Cargo vessels begin to thread through upland canyons. Arid land becomes soft and crumbly under the impact of moisture. Kilowatts of power drive pumping stations with a steady throb. Factories rise; farms are electrified; and light bills for homes and businesses inexorably shrink.

Forty-two miles east of Portland, Oregon, Bonneville Dam stretches across the Columbia River in the core of the Cascade Range. Already its powerhouse is turning out 86,400 kilowatts; another 108,000 kilowatts is in process of being added as the blades of two new generators are spun by the crashing water of the country's second largest river. In July still another 108,000 kilowatts will come into production. The Bonneville Power Administration announces that contracts calling for the disposal of 108,000 kilowatts already have been signed. Pending power sales, according to Dr. Paul J. Raver, the Bonneville administrator, will make a return of $60,000,000 to the government within the next two decades.

Downstream from Bonneville the Aluminum Company of America has built a plant which eventually may be the largest aluminum factory in the world. Soon the output of this plant will be fitted into the airplanes which patrol the Caribbean and the English Channel. Other industries are moving westward to take advantage of the greatest hydro-electric-power waterway ever surveyed. The Pennsylvania Salt Company has started a $500,000 plant on the river flats near Portland. Pacific Carbide and Alloy also has built a factory.

When President Roosevelt entered the White House in 1933, approximately 31 percent of Oregon's farms had electricity. Today that percentage has been virtually doubled. It now is 59 percent. Power rates also have been reduced for home and store consumers, particularly where People's Utility Districts have been organized to distribute Bonneville power on a publicly owned basis. In addition to all this, navigation on the Columbia River is at its highest level in history. More tonnage passed Bonneville last year than in the previous generation. At the dam the loftiest lift-locks on earth boost boats into the heart of the mountains.

On the upper reaches of the Missouri River in Montana, where Lewis and Clark glimpsed the Rockies on that first westward journey long ago, army engineers are piling up a 247-foot wall of mud which will be almost two miles long. This is Fort Peck Dam, ultimately to cost $100,000,000. As auxiliary features it will generate power and provide water for small irrigation undertakings. Its main purpose is to impound a lake as long as Lake Ontario, a lake 190 miles from the dam to its uppermost limit. This lake will provide water for navigation on the Missouri during the hot summer months when the river chokes and gasps and dwindles to a huge flat puddle. Water sent downstream by the floodgates at Fort Peck will make possible a nine-foot channel between Sioux City, Iowa, and the mouth of the Missouri near St. Louis.

California's prodigious Central Valley, 500 miles long, grows a considerable proportion of the nation's oranges, peaches, grapes, olives, spinach and asparagus. At the lower end of the valley, fields are seared by sun and drought. Like an invading army, sagebrush en-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

croaches on drying orchards. Guarding the northern rim of the valley, within sight of the Oregon border, Mount Shasta's mighty summit is a mass of glaciers and snowfields. Its slopes trill to the sound of falling water. Its watershed is ribbed with innumerable creeks and streams. Shasta Dam, now being constructed on the Sacramento River within the shadow of the huge peak, will store water that can be used to resuscitate perishing farms hundreds of miles away. This dam, under construction by the Bureau of Reclamation, will be the second most massive structure on earth. Water crashing over its spillway will tumble three times the height of Niagara Falls.

The government also is building Friant Dam on the San Joaquin River, another Central Valley waterway. Three hundred and fifty miles of canals will carry water to fields and orchards which, without this rescue, would wither and die. For years the ocean's tides have crept apace onto the rich delta of the Sacramento. Salt water has destroyed asparagus and fouled lettuce. Now the Sacramento will come down out of the mountains with increased force. The ocean will be driven out of the delta. In addition to all this, Shasta Dam will produce huge quantities of power which Governor Culbert L. Olson believes will enable Northern California to equal the light reductions achieved in the TVA and Bonneville areas.

In nearly all the eleven Far Western states—Washington, California, Oregon, Idaho, Montana, Wyoming, Arizona, Colorado, Utah, Nevada and New Mexico—there are other irrigation and power projects. These undertakings are huge in and of themselves, yet are dwarfed by such a colossus as Shasta Dam. On the Willamette River in Oregon $11,000,000 has been spent for dams that will control floods, prevent stream pollution and irrigate farms. Ultimately the enterprise will cost $60,000,000. New units are under construction to bolster the water supply of the Salt River project in Arizona. Thousands of migrants from the Dust Bowl have been settled by the Farm Security Administration on the broad flats of the Vale-Owyhee project along the border between Idaho and Oregon.

There are other similar projects too numerous to describe. An idea of their magnitude and numbers may be gained from the fact that the government must spend nearly $20,000,000 merely to relocate highways and railroads which will be flooded by the artificial lakes brought into existence. It is no exaggeration that these relocations constitute the major railroad construction problem now under way in the United States. The Pit River Bridge, which will take the Southern Pacific across the reservoir behind Shasta Dam, will be one of the great bridges of the world. Its piers, resting on a forested basin, will be the height of the thirty-six-story Time and Life Building in Rockefeller Center. Yet the basin will contain so much water that passengers on the Shasta Limited will look only thirty-four feet from the deck of the bridge to the surface of the artificial lake. Extensive tunnels and bridges, built by Uncle Sam, take the Union Pacific and U. S. 30 around Bonneville Dam. Other projects require parallel relocations.

The legal status of these vast dams in the West was immeasurably reinforced by the recent decision of the United States Supreme Court extending federal supervision of the nation's rivers. A majority of the Court held that the interest of the government in American waterways went beyond navigation alone. "Flood protection, watershed development, recovery of the cost through utilization of power," wrote Mr. Justice Reed, "are likewise parts of commerce control."

This put an extra layer of cement on the foundation of multiple-purpose dams. No longer is there any constitutional question about the right of the government to build a project which accomplishes four or five objectives instead of merely one. For example, at the Minidoka Dam on the Snake River in Idaho, additional irrigation facilities have been financed for years through the sale of surplus electricity. Navigation improvements at Bonneville are possible because of the income derived from power.

But these facts and statistics, staggering though they are, fail to compare with the mightiest project of all—Grand Coulee. Where the Columbia River twists across the barren plateau of central Washington, the biggest structure ever built by man blocks the river like a fortress. Ultimately Grand Coulee will be the greatest single source of electricity anywhere on the planet. Its capacity will be 10,708,000,000 kilowatt-hours. A pumping plant reminiscent of the machinery encountered on other worlds by Buck Rogers will heave the water of the Columbia River up onto the highlands to irrigate 1,200,000 acres of land. Engineers and soil experts are surveying this area now. Fifty thousand acres probably will be brought into production in about three years. After that, an additional 50,000 acres will be developed each year until late in the century. In the meantime Grand Coulee will produce electricity and control the river all the way to the sea.

A decade ago the Great Pyramid of Egypt, symbol of oppression and idolatry, was the most massive edifice on earth. Then it was exceeded slightly by Boulder Dam on the Colorado River, begun during the administration of President Hoover. When completed in 1944, Shasta Dam, too, will surpass the Egyptian tomb. And Grand Coulee, almost a mile long, 550 feet high and 500 feet thick at the foundation, triples the Pyramid's bulk. One must hope that these stupendous dams, dark and mysterious as dusk blankets the wilderness, will become symbols of an age in which people discovered that coöperative effort can put Nature's forces to work for the good of all mankind.

RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Washington Notes

No War Hysteria So Far

IF THE PRESIDENT, as some of his critics have said, were trying to provoke an incident on the high seas to arouse public indignation against the Nazis and create a cause for war, he could have done no better than l'affaire Robin Moor. It was as cold-blooded a raid as anyone looking for an excuse to shoot at his enemy would have wanted.

Yet the incident was handled with something more than reticence both at the White House and the State Department. First reports of the sinking were given out with warnings against jumping at conclusions. As news, they were overshadowed by repercussions from the seizure of the North American plant in California. Then, as if to keep them in an inconspicuous shadow, the White House announced the Supreme Court appointments. Not until the one boatload of survivors had been interviewed by an American consular official did the State Department let go the whole story, and by that time there was not much shock left in it.

It is doubtful whether there would have been very much anyway. The public has come to regard freedom-of-the-seas as a dangerous shibboleth—one of the empty slogans that drew this nation into a fight to make the world safe for democracy in 1917. The neutrality laws in effect abandoned our claim to sail the seven seas with impunity. The President's speech on May 27, reasserting that right, came too late to make it a fighting cause. The public's apparently lackadaisical acceptance of the news, when it finally broke, was what could have been expected.

If a majority of the American people are willing to fight Germany again, and they seem to be, it is because they realize that the world is not big enough to permit both the kind of life they want to live in the future and the kind the slaves of Germany must live. In all probability, there will never be in this war the same adventurous exhilaration, the same sense of crusading unity that lifted the masses of Americans out of themselves in the last war. They approach this struggle without enthusiasm but with resignation, and this may be transformed into a stronger determination than the last war produced. The Wheelers and the Lindberghs talk through their hats when they talk about the administration's attempts to whip up war hysteria. There has been no hysteria and no attempt to whip it up and there probably won't be. Unless, as a nation, we achieve some more stable emotion than mere indignation over an incident, we are sunk and the President knows it.

As expected, the Communists are making the most of the ammunition handed them by the army's seizure of the North American plant. But some of it is exploding in their hands. The most damaging consequence of the affair, so far as the comrades are concerned, is their identification. In two days Richard Frankensteen did more to inform the general public about the identity and method of operation of the Communists in the trade-union movement than the Dies Committee, with its front-page publicity and its smear tactics, has done in three years. Never in any strike situation have the sheep been so sharply set off from the goats. The separation occurred not only in the United Automobile Workers but in other unions where leaders of necessity supported either Frankensteen or the outlaws.

This was due in part, no doubt, to the dramatic impact of the circumstances. But it was not that alone. The Communists conducted themselves with less aplomb than usual. There was some conspicuous bungling. Trying to explain that the strike was necessary because the National Defense Mediation Board was "stalling" the strikers' committee, Lew Michener, West Coast regional director of the UAW, and Philip M. Connelly, California chief of the CIO, got themselves hopelessly fouled in their own fabrications. The three Washington negotiators, they said, reported the night before the strike call took effect that they were getting nowhere and recommended "action"—meaning a walk-out. Yet these same three negotiators, appearing before a Board panel the morning of the walk-out, said they had been on the telephone for hours the night before trying to dissuade the back-home members of the committee from calling out the men. Again, Michener and Connelly insisted that Frankensteen, who had final authority to approve or veto the walk-out, could not be reached the night the decision was made. Yet Frankensteen had been in communication with the committee that night trying to keep the men on the job until the Mediation Board finished its work.

Even if the Board had been stalling, which it obviously was not, there was no reason for the strikers' committee to get excited. An agreement already had been reached to make whatever wage settlement was negotiated retroactive to May 1. Time was a factor that played into the hands of the union, which, according to Connelly, was gaining membership by the hundreds. In the circumstances, nobody stood to lose anything by delay except the company. The record of the Board virtually guaranteed that the demands of the union for increased pay would be granted either in full or in substantial part.

The whole performance indicated very clearly that the strike committee wanted a strike and not a settlement, even a favorable one. It was his conviction that the strike leaders were not on the up-and-up that pushed the President into the extreme measure of breaking the strike by armed force. Frankensteen, in his statements, clearly implied approval of the President's course and said he spoke also for Philip Murray. But Murray, in a statement issued after the dust had cleared, disapproved use of troops and condemned legislation then pending to give the President statutory power to seize struck plants. In this statement, Murray passed lightly over the Communist issue, which Frankensteen had underscored. The day before his statement came out, Murray ate lunch in a public restaurant with Lewis and Pressman, both of whom were suspected of prodding the Communists into calling the North American strike and thus making trouble for Murray and the President.

The columning firm of Joseph Alsop and Robert Kintner closed up shop last week. In one of their last columns they reported that an American patrol ship had dropped depth bombs and perhaps sunk a German U-boat off Greenland while picking up survivors of the Hood battle. The story violated Navy Department press rules. By the time it appeared, Alsop already had been sworn into service as a Naval Intelligence officer. Kintner is in the army.

Washington T. R. B.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Fritz Lang and Company

WE SHOULD TRY to forget that the picture "Man Hunt" was made from the book "Rogue Male." No good ever came out of comparisons yet, except they were made responsibly for purposes of clarifying points, gauging effects, etc., and in this case Dudley Nichols and Fritz Lang as writer and director were faced with the problem of taking material that had a great deal to do with mental states and reworking it into terms of action.

"Man Hunt" starts out with a dilettante English sportsman who has got bored with animals as big game, and come to within five hundred odd yards of the Führer's country place in Germany. He does not believe he is going to shoot: just wants to prove he can do it, and hold that man steady in his sight telescope. But the Gestapo surprises him, and then goes to work. (Objection number one: there might have been more stalk and less talk afterwards, for as it is, the game seems too easy and the point is not fairly made.)

There is the torture, with no results, the Gestapo's reconsideration and decision to frame an accident, their failure to make the accident hard enough and the chase through Germany, onto an English ship and into England. He meets a cockney girl who helps him evade the several German agents on his heels, which means he is to have more than a personal motive in doing the enemy in. As in the book, he is gradually learning anyway that there was a subconscious feeling deeper than stalking for sport behind his venture, that these people and their methods are repugnant to him as a decent free person. So when he has killed one of the agents and got clear of London, and word comes that the girl has been captured and killed by the other side, he is ready to try it again in deadly earnest, without failing again.

Meanwhile they have got him holed up in the cave where he has been hiding somewhere in the English countryside, and the Gestapo man in charge of operations proceeds with his final piece of chicanery, is denounced once and for all and finally tricked, and the end of the picture comes when our man gets into active service at the outbreak of war, and bales out of a British plane once more into German hunting territory. (Objection number two: as the climax sequence of the picture, this should have been built up more, led into more firmly and carried out with less haste. They had a wonderful set for the approach to the cave and the cave itself, but we are suddenly in the middle of it without more preparation than a dissolve or two, and all the fine suspense the book achieved in the minute preparations, first for concealment, then for escape, is passed over here. The picture is overlength at least ten minutes, but the thing to have sacrificed was the earlier talk.)

It is Fritz Lang's picture, of course, his first good chance in several years to get a script with something to it and a writer on it. He had about the best in the way of cameraman, art direction, scoring and cutting; but I think without knowing any of this, or who he was himself, you would sense the creative presence there of an artist in the medium. Lang gets depth in every scene he makes; he is a careful and thorough man with detail; and his first concern is with the rightness and immediacy of each fragment as it appears to you, makes its impression, leads you along with each incident of the story and projects the imagination beyond into things to come. He is one of the best men with the feeling of crowds, with life going on around the particular action, that is. He is vigilant in his use of actors to make the scene itself more important than any one line or reaction, so that camera, lighting and background give shape to action and meaning to a situation. It would make good gossip to say that he breaks every slight maneuver down into its component parts with step-by-step diagram of A here, B there, camera here and X crossing; but that is only a surface indication of the main thing, which is that he knows pictures, he thinks in terms of how to make them achieve the truth of life and the excitement of movement.

Walter Pidgeon and George Sanders are the two principal acting people, and good use was made of John Carradine as the deadly pursuer. Joan Bennett is not a perfect cockney by any means, but there was a sweetness to the interlude with her which helped keep desperate deeds on a plane of living, and the writing, acting and direction of her leave-taking was a very nice original bit (the girl in the book, as you remember, was all in the mind, and rather dragged in). There were others, each in his place. But more than many films, this was a writer-director proposition; its strength and weakness lie finally in those departments. Its weakness is that as melodrama it is uneven, there is just something off balance in its progression, there is a sense when you have got to a big event that the event is not big enough. Its strength is that it is made with such care and polish that it does not seem melodrama, that it seems true. And in its manipulation of these dark and intent forces on a checkerboard, it manages to take your breath away. There is an actual vividness about it that makes you wish it could somehow come out more penetrating and terrible.

Mickey Churchmouse Department. – It is unfortunate that of all the studios in Hollywood, it should be Walt Disney's where the workers had to go on strike. But it is not surprising. Disney himself is a charming fellow; he has the gift of getting his workers to like him and contribute with democratic freedom to whatever they are all engaged on; he is sending out good pictures and bringing good millions back; and he is operating what is by Hollywood standards a sweatshop. The idea out toward Burbank is that cartoons marketed at Class-A Hollywood prices are not to be made by anything like Hollywood wage scales. The Disney studio has all the easy informality of a New York department store—girls coming in with a college and art-school background do a good racking six days of work for sixteen or seventeen lousy dollars a week, with efficiency checker-uppers and rest-room watchers and with one of the more notorious speed-up systems operating as in any factory. Above the fact that Disney is getting fifty to a hundred skilled craftsmen for the weekly price of one Hollywood bum with a profile, is the way that you can hear in his commissary someone say with awe: "Oh, that's one of the *big* guys, gets three or three-five." And they do not mean $3,500, which is what this would mean on any major lot unless it were for laughs: $350 is a rising man, strictly elite of type. Well the hundreds working, elite or not, have apparently gone out to wake up Mr. Disney. The man must be sleeping to think he can be the magician who makes ten million children laugh and wonder, and at the same time employ the hands of men who can't be sure the kids of their own will have the good clothes to go to school.

OTIS FERGUSON

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Bandwagon

Despite the cry of steel shortage, the fact is that practically no shutdowns have occurred among consumers because of lack of steel. . . . Wooden ships are being built to relieve steel. – *A story in Steel Magazine, as reported in The Chicago Tribune.*

Klode contended that the building now leased [for the Wisconsin Workshop for the Blind] was not as much of a fire hazard as the legislative committee believed.

"There is a fireboat moored next to it, and there is an engine house only a block away," said Klode. – *Frank C. Klode, state director of public welfare, as reported in The Milwaukee Journal.*

Lesson Successful, Student Dead

"In mock wars, troops are too slipshod about the way they expose themselves," explained the officers. "They commit blunders because they know they are not facing danger. If even one bullet in every 10,000 were real, they would fight as though they were engaged in real war. They would be cautious. Fighting would be realistic and of great value." – *AP report of an informal discussion by army officers at Camp Hunter Liggett, California, in The New York Herald Tribune.*

The Best Is None Too Good

Mrs. Luce told of visiting the air-raid shelters in the Chungking caves, where 700 Chinese perished from suffocation Thursday night. Despite the accident, the shelters are "the best in the world," she said. – *From The New York Times.*

The Compleat Anglo

A bewildered American who hadn't seen her since China said he found her in Nassau completely well gowned, completely gracious, completely composed, completely complete. – *From the article, "The Windsor Team," in Life Magazine.*

Barriers-Burned-Away Department

"It was the little people," Lord Marley declared, "who made the decision that Hitler was to be resisted to the last ditch—not the government. They recreated a mechanized army, they armed 1,500,000 men and they demanded that there should be no more privileged class.

"They demanded equality of sacrifice from everybody and they are getting what they demanded. It is quite common now to see Englishmen speaking to each other in public, although they have never been formally introduced." – *From The New York Times.*

Our readers are invited to contribute to this column; $1 will be paid for each item used. Address Bandwagon, care of The New Republic. Please enclose the original clipping. – THE EDITORS

Correspondence

Clarification from Secretary Ickes

SIR: In your issue of June 9 appears an editorial, "Saving Daylight and Saving Power," in which you say: "We are certain that so stalwart an exponent of sound power policy as Secretary Ickes did not intend his daylight-saving scheme as a substitute for the development of new power sources." You suggest that "a word of reassurance from those in Washington responsible for the supply of power for defense industry would be in order."

So far as public power to be developed by the federal government is concerned, you may be assured that there is no necessity for "a word of reassurance." The program of this department and of others interested in such power has been both accelerated and enlarged as the result of the defense situation. Much has appeared on this subject in the public press. And of course we realize that the amount of power that can be saved if we should have nationwide daylight-saving is only a drop in the bucket. However, there is much to be said in favor of daylight-saving throughout the entire country in addition to the power that it would make available for other purposes.

You also have an editorial "No Gas on Sunday!" In reply to an entirely unexpected question at a recent press conference, I suggested that we might have to get along on less gasoline. My mind went back to the other great world war and I did use the expression "gasolineless Sundays." However, this was merely a convenient symbol that occurred to me in order to press my point home. There are suggestions of many methods by which gasoline can be conserved until the stringency in gasoline and oil transportation to the Atlantic coast has been met, and others will occur. We want to be effective, but no snap judgment will be indulged in. It may very well be that rationing would do the job better "with a minimum of dislocation."

Washington, D. C. HAROLD L. ICKES

The Virus Spreads in France

[The following letter from Marseilles, received from a correspondent known to The New Republic, was dated May 5. – THE EDITORS]

The Y——s are here, waiting to get their United States visa renewed. They are living in a Marseilles hotel. A few weeks ago the police arrived for what is called in France a *rafle* and took all the Jews, French and non-French, away in the Black Maria. Y—— was among them. His daughter called me up about it, and I telephoned the chief of police and got him released in ten minutes. Nevertheless this shows how unpopular Jews are here officially now. The same thing happened to Mrs. X——, despite the fact that she is an American citizen. She was held for several hours and questioned closely about her "race"; it is extraordinary, almost unbelievable, but true. We understand that the police of the Bouches du Rhône are under instructions to expel all Jews from the department—possibly, the rumor has it, for military reasons, on orders of the Germans; anyway, there has been much of this sort of thing going on lately. I haven't been touched, because they know I'm not Jewish.

The anti-Semitism of France is not just official any more, either. It is beginning to take hold of the people. Apparently it is the easiest virus to spread in any country. At the current showing of the anti-Semitic version of "Jew Süss," the audiences whistle at the Jew (exact French equivalent of hissing in America or the German practice of saying "pfui") and shout "*A bas les Juifs*"; it may be the Doriotists in the audience, but the impression is that it is general. There are also anti-Semitic posters which attract the attention and approval of crowds. They are put out by the propaganda office of the "national revolution"—not so bad as the Stürmer stuff, but the same idea *au fond*.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The WPA in a Wise Community

SIR: You deserve hearty praise for your editorial, "Save the WPA," in your issue of June 2.

It is too bad that having accepted the recommendation to destroy the eighteen-months' rule and end the exclusion of aliens, President Roosevelt proposes such an undeserved cut in the WPA personnel. Naturally, the construction projects will be affected by priority claims both for materials and for personnel, but there are a thousand and one valuable community services which are being carried on by the WPA which are now more than ever vitally necessary to the morale of the American community.

For example, the work in naturalization, school meals for children from necessitous families, the campaign against economic illiteracy being carried on by the Workers' Service Program, WPA, the varied contributions made to the cultural enrichment of our nation—all these should not be destroyed so ruthlessly. The increased trade-union membership to be given explanations of its rights and duties, the organized and unorganized workers who need information about new social-security legislation, and the problems arising from the springing up of boom towns near the army camps and at the sites of new industrial plants are only a few of the opportunities for community service. The dislocation of industry by defense production and the readjustment necessary when peace comes make inadvisable such unwarranted reductions in this industrial ambulance work developed by the New Deal to meet the depression crisis.

I hope that your protest will be read by the congressmen and the general public, many of whom suffer from a deep ignorance concerning the contribution which the WPA has made to our well being and the way in which it has developed many services which a wise community would adopt permanently.

New York City MARK STARR

Eire and the War

SIR: In his open letter to Mr. de Valera published in your issue of May 12, Professor Francis E. McMahon asks "merely" that three Irish ports be given to England for the prosecution of the war. He bases his appeal upon the grounds that the cause of England "*today* is the cause of all humanity"; that she is fighting for justice, human dignity, the Christian religion, true culture and the freedom of small nations, including Ireland; that her victory depends upon getting possession of three Irish ports.

First of all, let me point out that the giving of facilities to one belligerent for an attack upon another is an act of war. Therefore, the professor's proposition is: that Ireland should join in the war. The Irish people, in the free portion of Ireland, decided against this policy after weighing fully what both belligerents said, and refrained from saying, about their war aims; and after weighing carefully what both belligerents did, and refrained from doing, to give practical effect where and when they could to the admirable principles for which Professor McMahon says England is fighting.

Our decision to remain neutral was supported by 99.9 percent of our people of all classes and creeds as well as by every Catholic bishop in the state. Professor McMahon may know better where our duty lies than we do ourselves, but as a small and very democratic people we would not peacefully submit to the judgment of three millions of us being overruled by the opinion of one man 3,300 miles away. Even if Mr. de Valera agreed with Professor McMahon's views, he has no moral or constitutional authority to commit our people to war. According to our Constitution, the right to declare war or to engage the state in war belongs solely to the Dail, and for anyone deliberately without due and proper authority to give our ports to a belligerent or to do anything else which would inevitably bring about a war situation, involving the sacrifice of the lives of our soldiers and of our people, would be nothing short of unjustifiable homicide.

As for the strategic importance of the three ports in free Ireland, I fear Professor McMahon does not realize that the British still occupy six of our northeastern counties—against the will of the Irish people. In these occupied counties are situated ports and air bases covering the only Atlantic route which the British have used to any important extent since the fall of France. If ports and land-based planes can protect shipping, the British are strategically as well off as if they were in occupation of all Ireland.

We do not forget, as Professor McMahon says, that "centuries ago Eire rolled back a tide of barbarism, as her scholars and saints spread over Europe instructing the ignorant in faith and sound philosophy." Perhaps, if with God's help we survive the present European holocaust, our young men and women will once again undertake the noble work of missionaries in Europe. They are at present doing missionary work in many countries. Even if it were desirable, we have not the military strength to enforce Christianity throughout the world by the sword. The best we can hope to do in the present circumstances of our partitioned country is to protect against aggression the portion for which we obtained freedom after such a long and arduous struggle, and in which we are trying to put into practical operation the principles of Christianity, democracy and social justice which are contained in our Constitution.

FRANK AIKEN
Minister for Coördination of
Washington, D. C. Defensive Measures, Eire

From The New Republic Mail Bag

Responding to our editorial, "What Comes After the War?" (May 26), A. Lou Cohen of Seattle, Washington, believes that a subsidy to manufacturers to make up the difference between labor costs in the United States and in Europe is the answer. He draws a parallel between such a subsidy and the "tariff to protect infant industries"; his purpose is to protect the American wage scale and standard of living. . . . Guy Emery Shipler, editor of The Churchman, points out that the current issue of that magazine contains two replies, one by the Rev. William C. Kernan and one by Charles C. Burlingham, to the recent action of a convention of the Episcopal Diocese of New York in passing an anti-labor resolution (The New Republic, May 26). Both deplore the resolution and the speech by the Rev. Dr. Floyd Van Keuren which prompted it and maintain that Dr. Van Keuren misrepresents the attitude of the Episcopal Church.

Antioch College will hold a Conference on Progressive Action and Post-War Reconstruction, at Yellow Springs, Ohio, June 27 to 29.

H. C. Barnes, Schodack Landing, New York, writes to say that he was very much interested in Bruce Bliven's article, "The Genes and the Hope of Mankind" (The New Republic, April 14), and has some scientific data to add to it. As follows: "Some thirty years ago a young woman asked her husband to help her try to have a girl baby with a dimple. He said, 'All right, but make her superior in every way.' So they made this their interest beginning before conception and continuing through pregnancy. The child was judged second best in a county test of all high schools in the county. After high school she worked her way through college and passed a graduate course in library work and is now in a library in Ohio. This girl's brothers and her parents are middle class (or less). This experiment indicates that a young healthy couple can produce superior children if they try. If more details are wanted, send stamped, addressed envelope. P.S. She has a dimple."

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Books in Review

Ambiguous Answers

THIS BOOK[1] is a study in the Victorian heresy of absolute monism in terms of its three greatest prophets. All three were alike in that none was a particularly original thinker: Darwin stole from his grandfather, Buffon and Lamarck; Marx stole from Malthus and Sismondi; Wagner stole from Berlioz and Meyerbeer. None was remarkably lucid or consistent, but then, as Mr. Barzun remarks, "at certain moments in the history of man, it will not do to be too clear." Their common "genius was *par excellence* the genius of taking pains; they were colossal workers in an age when patient industry was mistaken for an intellectual quality: they presented themselves as recorders of what was—secretaries of the universe taking down its dictations." And their common success was their adoption of a simple, sloganizable, basic principle by which the riddle of the Sphinx could be solved:

> The Survival of the Fittest, the Theory of Value and Surplus Value, the Leitmotif and its function were the artless props of the three constructions. The public could thus enjoy the double pleasure of simpleness and profundity. The chaotic universe of change was made rational by the ordinary fact of struggle; the anarchy of social existence was organized around class hatred; the tumultuous sea of harmony in the music drama could be charted with a guide to the motifs. The beholder began with a matter of fact and could reach symbolism and true knowledge with only an effort of application and memory . . . and at the end each system yielded the most exalted objects of contemplation; the adaptation of living forms; a perfect state; a religion of art and the regeneration of mankind.

Of the religious emotions aroused by them, Mr. Barzun gives some amusing examples:

> One who, like myself, has been for many years a convinced adherent of the theory of selection can only reply: we assume so, but cannot prove it in any case. (Weismann.)

> We will not say . . . here is truth, kneel down here. We expose new principles to the world out of the principles of the world itself . . . we explain to it only the real object for which it struggles, and consciousness is a thing it *must* acquire even if it objects to it. (Marx.)

> For works of art to transform a race there is no need of their being known, so that despite our ignorance of music we have all been powerfully influenced by this new art of Wagner's. (Revue Wagnerienne.)

Each of the three had his antitype: Darwin had Samuel Butler, who asserted the "interest" of living organisms against "the tiger and the gazelle with slightly longer legs"; Marx had Proudhon, who asserted the freedom of men to "develop in their living tissue a new and more inclusive set of perceptions, feelings, desires and needs," against the parthenogenetic creation of the capitalist by the steam-operated mill; Wagner had Nietzsche (or Bizet) who asserted the gayety of "divine superficiality" against "agitating the swamp." Against their determinism, creative purpose; against their materialism, vitalism; against their monism, pluralism.

If I understand Mr. Barzun rightly, the three ogres mark a return to the mechanistic materialism of the eighteenth century, and the three angels carry on the tradition of Rousseau and Romanticism: the modern heirs of the former are well known; the modern heirs of the latter are William James pragmatists. But historical classification does not explain historical change. If the monism of Darwin and Marx triumphed over the pluralism of earlier Romanticism, if the "untutored mind" will take the assertion of pragmatism that morality is not universal to mean that there is no morality, it is important to know why. Either the majority are totally depraved in contrast to the few illuminati, or else there is some fundamental defect in both attitudes. Adopting Mr. Barzun's own argument, what purpose, in fact, was served by the absolutists which made them pragmatically successful?

I do not think either Romanticism or its successors can be understood unless we see all of their thinking as an attempt to explain the existence of evil on the assumption that man's essential nature is uncorrupted, *i. e.*, on a non-Christian basis.

The Romantics asserted that essential being was vitality and will, man in his physical diversity, and that dogmatic ideas and authoritarian social institutions which were removable were the source of evil. When the institutions and dogmas were overthrown and evil still remained, men sought an answer in materialism. Behind the doctrine of materialism lies, not a love, but a hatred of matter. It is no accident that Darwin could not become a doctor because he could not bear to inflict pain; that Marx should have been so clearly obsessed with the physical horror of industrial society; that Wagner regarded sex as a torment (nothing could be less "biological" and more mental than the love of Tristan and Isolde). For them, essential being was the "good" idea which at one and the same time promised the self-regeneration of matter in the future and relieved the still evil present with the stoic consolation of understanding it.

Just as were their criticisms of their opponents, the Romantics were defeated—and very understandably, because, with the same assumption of the essential goodness of man, they reached even more pessimistic conclusions. The Materialists at least promised salvation for *all* in the future; Samuel Butler saw no hope except for those with private incomes, Nietzsche no hope except for the superman. As Paul Tillich says:

> It could be said "look at minerals and flowers, look at animals and men, look at history and arts and you will learn what being is, but do not ask for being itself above all of them." To this we

[1] Darwin, Marx and Wagner, by Jacques Barzun. Boston: Little, Brown and Company. 432 pages. $2.50.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

must answer: You cannot prevent man from asking the most human question. . . . Man is more than apparatus for registering so-called facts and their interdependence. He wants to know about himself as thrown into being, to know about the powers and structures controlling this being in himself and in his world. He wants to know the meaning of being because he is man and not only an epistemological subject. Therefore he transcends and always must transcend the "no-trespassing" signs, cautiously built by skepticism and dogmatically guarded by pragmatism. The meaning of being is his basic concern, is the really human and philosophical question. But this brings us to the point in which philosophy shows a theological character. For this is the task of theology: to ask for being as far as it gives us ultimate concern.

It is all very well for pragmatism to say "we shall know a truth by relating its consequences to its avowed purpose." Of course all truths are operative truths, but in all serious matters we ourselves are the operation, and the real difficulty is not to discover the consequences but to have the faith to undertake the operation at all. Pragmatism is a self-sufficient guide for testing the truth of a statement like "two oranges plus two oranges equals four oranges," because if the result turns out to be three or five oranges, we can repeat the experiment. But in serious matters our natures are changed in the course of testing them; we can never repeat ourselves. The success of Darwinism and Marxism is unpleasant evidence of what happens when the Absolute is dismissed with a damn and the problem of human "anxiety" ignored. It returns not in its proper theological shape, but exactly where it has no business to be, in epistemology, moralism and estheticism.

"Trust in God and take short views," said Sydney Smith. The possibility of the second half of his sentence depends upon the first.

W. H. AUDEN

Finger Exercise

The Transposed Heads: A Legend of India, by Thomas Mann. Translated by H. T. Lowe-Porter. New York: Alfred A. Knopf. 196 pages. $2.

WAITING for the return of the mood in which he started his Joseph cycle—it is a hard mood to recapture, considering the heights he had reached in the last volume of "Joseph in Egypt" and considering, too, the public worries by which novelists have been distracted—waiting but not idle, Thomas Mann has been writing what he calls finger exercises. There was first "The Beloved Returns," which for almost anyone else would have been a major novel; now comes "The Transposed Heads," which is shorter and philosophically playful.

The scene is ancient India during a period of religious exaltation and longing for the womb of the great Mother. The principal characters are Shridaman the merchant, his wife Sita of the beautiful hips, and his friend Nanda the cowherd. Both men commit suicide in the shrine of the fearful goddess-mother Kali, decapitating themselves in a frenzy of mixed emotions: awe of the goddess, love for the round-hipped Sita and loyalty to each other. Sita is preparing to die in her turn, when suddenly she hears the voice of Kali telling her that husband and friend will both be restored to life if she puts their heads back on their bodies and repeats the proper incantation. At this point Sita makes a mistake that is not altogether a mistake. She exchanges the two heads, partly in haste and confusion, partly in the subconscious hope that her husband will now unite in himself the best features of the two men she loves: the intelligent head of Shridaman and the warm, strong body of Nanda. Her hope is at first gratified, but slowly she finds that it is being thwarted by daily life, and the end is the death of all three hopelessly intermingled people: Shridaman-Nanda in a duel with Nanda-Shridaman, and Sita on the widow's funeral pyre.

This legend of India—for which Dr. Mann is indebted to the Indian scholar Heinrich Zimmer, the author of "Maya"—is obviously not being retold for its mere interest as a story. It has other values, some of which would be clear even to a careless reader. Nanda is a symbol of intuition and life on the physical plane; Shridaman is a symbol of intellect and the ideal. Their adventures are in one sense a fable for artists, the moral of it being that neither the emotionalist (for example, D. H. Lawrence) nor the intellectualist (for example, Paul Valéry) can hope by himself to conquer beauty. In another sense, Dr. Mann is writing a parable for society in our times, implying that the separation of intellect and emotion is leading to the self-destruction of both. In still another sense, he is personalizing the dialectic: Nanda and Shridaman are united in opposition, like the Hegelian thesis and antithesis. They end by destroying each other, but the child of these two fathers will unite the good qualities of both. And the child's name is Samadhi, which is to say, Collection.

"The Transposed Heads" has other meanings too, which one can follow in an always widening and deepening spiral. But the value of fiction does not depend on its philosophical message, however inspiring that may be; and the psychological effect of all these symbolic meanings is to distract the reader's attention from the story that ought to be his first concern.

It is true that the story is told with Dr. Mann's absolutely unequaled skill and virtuosity. He is like a magician rolling up his sleeves and smiling at the audience while he announces that he is going to perform miracles—and then performing them before our eyes. He starts with abstractions like Intellect and Beauty and gives them shape as living people. He puts these people into impossible situations which he then makes emotionally convincing. The more difficult the problem he has to face, the more brilliantly he solves it. For example, there is the moment when the fearful goddess has to speak in her own voice, a moment that might easily be pompous or preposterous. Dr. Mann evades these dangers by making Kali speak in the magnified voice of a very ordinary woman, a Mrs. Nickleby raised to the Hindu pantheon. There is the problem of bringing the past to life, which he solves by using psychological instead of historical methods. Meanwhile he enjoys his own skill, has fun with his characters, speaks in rhyme when the mood is on him, and evokes an atmosphere of mellow sensuality that is new to his writing. One feels, however, that he is somewhat too self-conscious, as if the magician were more interested in his technique than in the results of it; on this occasion, his hand is quicker than his heart. And although the audience gapes and applauds, it is not deeply moved. Perhaps it is puzzled by the meaning of all these feats. Perhaps it is wondering how Joseph will fare on his release from prison.

MALCOLM COWLEY

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Communism v. Common Sense

A Faith to Live for, by John Strachey. New York: Random House. 146 pages. $1.75.
The Way Out, by Earl Browder. New York: International Publishers. 255 pages. $1.75.

I LAST SAW JOHN STRACHEY in a little village outside London in October, 1939. He approved the Soviet-Nazi pact and the Russian invasion of Poland because "what a socialist government does is good for socialism." He agreed with the Communists in their opposition to Britain's war against Fascist Germany. But later he joined the Home Guard and now he is a volunteer in the RAF. He has changed his mind about Soviet policy and about the nature of the war.

When Hitler invaded Norway in April, 1940, it became clear to the anti-imperialist Strachey that this was not an ordinary war among imperialists. To call it that is a "downright lie." Britain, according to Strachey, is resisting Nazi world conquest. "We are fighting to prevent our subjugation," he asserts. "The Nazis intend to make us their slaves." He condemns the "criminal irresponsibility" of "those supremely clever fools" who say it is immaterial what masters the British masses have. Moreover, "to talk today," as Communists do, "of an unassisted uprising or revolution *after* their conquest by a power such as the Nazis is . . . ludicrous."

Opposing "a compromise, patched-up peace" because it would help Hitler win later on, Strachey continues the fight against Hitler and Mussolini which his ex-comrades —who fought those dictators in Spain and were, until August 23, 1939, ready to resist them elsewhere—have now abandoned. Each Englishman, he believes, is in the war to create a new world in his own image, and since there are many Englishmen there is as yet no unanimity on peace aims. But when we ask what *he* is fighting for, he answers, "Truth and love. These two principles are the only things worth fighting for, and consequently worth living for."

I find this most interesting. Strachey, the Marxist and dialectician, the logician and debater, formerly a very successful popularizer of Communist thought, now resorts to these idealistic and ethical terms. He is servicing airplanes that dispute Hitler's command of the air. He has helped extinguish Nazi-set fires and been under Hitler's bombs. Have their blasts uncovered some wells of emotion which he is not ashamed to reveal? I do not know. But the fact that Strachey discusses the British and world crises on the plane of moral values indicates to me that he considers this the best approach to the British mind. As a propagandist, he is catering to a mood. He is talking the words which his country grasps most readily. That tells me a great deal about the spirit of Britain today.

But "truth and love" are merely new forms, new bottles. The wine is the same that Strachey always sold—socialism. "In order to fight for truth and love," he says, "it is necessary for us to transform our dealings with each other . . . to start to share burdens and sacrifices." He is critical of the England of today. He attacks capitalism and advocates immediate changes toward socialism. He is the enemy of fascism in Germany, in Italy, in Japan and in England. "The events of 1940," he proclaims, "have made me far more certain than before that socialism is a right and true thing." But he has learned that "Socialism . . . may be a forced, disfigured, distorted kind of socialism" as in the Soviet Union.

Earl Browder, American Communist leader, now in prison, publishes a collection of recent articles and speeches under the title, "The Way Out." He says the Soviet-Nazi pact was "on the lines which the Soviet Union had always held out to all nations." This is not true. The Soviets had offered pacts with escape clauses in case of aggression. He says: "Since the Soviet Union, if not itself attacked, had not the slightest reason to attack Germany. . . ." This violates every canon of collective security which Stalin and Litvinov preached with so much fervor for so many years. The essence of collective security was that a country marched against an aggressor even if not attacked itself, and this idea is written into Article 49 of the new Soviet Constitution. He says Moscow gave Lithuania its ancient capital, Vilna, "as a free gift." Then Moscow swallowed Lithuania, Vilna and all. He says "Britain first violated Norwegian neutrality" which provoked the German invasion. He says: "What reason is there to believe that an Allied victory will bring anything better to the world than a German victory?"

"We need not be pessimistic about the future of the world at all," Browder comforts us. "However destructive" the present may be, "it cannot destroy the human race." When thousands are dying and millions suffering the horror of war this is a cold, cruel, inhuman sentiment.

LOUIS FISCHER

Riches for a Quarter

New Writing in Europe, by John Lehmann. New York: Pelican Books. 158 pages. 25 cents.

WITH UNDUE MODESTY, Mr. John Lehmann expresses a hope that his "New Writing in Europe" will provide "a useful introductory guide to some of the most gifted writers of our time, and an explanation of what they are trying to say. . . ." That his hopes have been fulfilled there can be little doubt. A book on this subject has been sorely needed for a long while, and no one could have been better equipped for the task than Mr. Lehmann.

After a brief chapter dealing with the influence writers of the twenties had on the work of the succeeding generation, the reader is promptly introduced to a world of which the author has an intimate personal knowledge; one, in fact, in which he himself has played a unique part. Nearly ten years ago there was started in London an anthology of poems and satires under the title of "New Signatures," whose contributors included: W. H. Auden, Cecil Day Lewis, Richard Eberhart, William Empson, Stephen Spender and the author of the present volume. In the following year a second anthology—"New Country"—appeared, whose general tone was now definitely political. Some of these young writers were "Communist" poets. None, however, bears that label today. If the dozens of authors mentioned in the course of this book share one thing in common, it is a wholehearted hatred of fascism. From this nucleus then, Mr. Lehmann, himself always a member of the "movement," traces here in detail the his-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tory and development of new creative writing in England from the early thirties to the present day. The story is supplemented with so many quotations from the authors' works—as well as eighteen portraits—that the book itself might almost be called an anthology. In these pages there are no fewer than thirty-seven references to W. H. Auden, whose achievements are undoubtedly greater than those of any other writer of his generation. The works of Isherwood, Day Lewis and Spender are also reviewed and quoted at such length that these references may be said to form short but comprehensive literary biographies of the writers.

This much, however, constitutes but the first half of the book. The second is devoted to the Continent—the greater part to France, and to Spain during the civil war. In 1933 Mr. Lehmann himself founded and edited the now famous book-magazine New Writing—"the first magazine to feature foreign writers as prominently as British." To obtain material for this new venture Mr. Lehmann traveled all over Europe, seeking out young authors from Moscow to Madrid, visiting them personally, often translating their writings himself, finally to publish works of Russians, Hungarians, Greeks, side by side with those of French, Spaniards, English and Germans. A critical survey of this work, a final chapter on "Afterthoughts in Wartime," a bibliography and an Index to Authors—are all here in a pocket-size volume for a quarter of a dollar.

JAMES STERN

Property and the Public

Life, Liberty and Property, by Alfred Winslow Jones. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Company. 397 pages. $3.50.

THIS BOOK grew out of a statistical investigation designed to discover how far public opinion has moved toward the point at which action against corporations would become practical politics. Repudiating the simplistic procedures of the Gallup and Fortune polls, the author drew up an elaborate questionnaire, took two years over the interviews (some seventeen hundred of them!) and, for reasons which I at least find entirely satisfactory, limited his study to a single, highly industrialized community—Akron, Ohio.

His major conclusions, which have for some reason been widely received as good news for friends of the status quo, run—with all the tentativeness which social scientists expect of one another—as follows:

Public opinion (assuming that the Akron community is typical of the country as a whole) is ready to support any change likely to make for greater security for life, liberty and *property*. However, it makes no distinction between *corporate* property and *private* property, and would, in the light of its present knowledge, stubbornly resist anything which it regarded as an attack on the latter. There is, at least with respect to corporate property, no such correspondence between individual opinion and economic position as a certain theory has taught us to expect—the industrial workers, for example, cling very close to the "central compromising morality" of the community, and the community as a whole divides, where it divides at all, along lines which bear little demonstrable relation to economic interest.

Why, except on a highly myopic view of the future, any of these conclusions should gladden the hearts of those who identify their own interests with those of the corporations, is more than I can see. Exactly the point about existing law is that it is tilted in favor of corporate property (*i.e.*, not at all that it places corporate property on a plane of equality with personal rights to life, liberty and property), and can, in the democratic long run, be maintained therefore only by a public opinion which concedes to corporate property rights a sanctity which it denies to personal rights. When the day comes on which the corporations must content themselves with equality before the law, they will have been whipped; and Jones holds out the hope that that day is not far distant.

Only a hope, however; for I have scant confidence in the statistical data upon which his conclusions rest, and this despite the fact that he employs statistical techniques with great skill and assurance. As often happens with scholars who by-pass theory and seek wisdom by ringing doorbells, he never reached a satisfactory understanding with himself as to what he was measuring. Each one interviewed was assigned a score, high if he showed approval, low if he showed disapproval, medium if he showed indecision, for actions (described in a series of eight simple narratives) conferring preferred status on corporate property rights over "human" rights to shelter, sustenance, employment, etc. Unfortunately, however, each problem is so posed that the interviewee cannot express disapproval of the action in question without sanctioning a patent violation of existing law; consequently it is a nice question whether the low scorers believe in a downward revision of corporate property rights, or anarchy, or a little of both.

The value of the book lies in the light it throws upon the inadequacy of existing techniques for estimating public attitudes, in its able reporting of some of the more interesting interviews, and in the attention it focuses upon a task which the Left in the United States now has cut out for it: making intelligible to ordinary people the special characteristics of corporate property.

WILLMOORE KENDALL

Horatio on the Bridge

The Captain from Connecticut, by C. S. Forester. Boston: Little, Brown and Company. 344 pages. $2.50.

YOU COULD let the title stand if it read, Horatio Hornblower Rides Again. His hero this time—a United States naval commander in the War of 1812—is not the same, but you have to read that not *quite* the same. Mr. Forester's fighting officers tend to be rough but sensitive men, with admirable qualities which they keep under a painful and iron control, efficient to a point of hairline accuracy in the difficult forms of naval action, susceptible to one overwhelming passion for the accomplished niece of some very high person and ridden by some Terrible Memory. They lack grace but they win the battles and the niece, and so long as the formula makes for interesting point-by-point reconstruction of thrilling times and maneuvers, Mr. Forester need not apologize to readers.

Captain Josiah Peabody got his frigate outside the British blockade by the narrowest margin and raised hell with the rich merchant traffic of the West Indies until peace was declared. He had a couple of major engagements with British men of war and got into a spot when the wind failed one morning and news of the English-French peace came

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to Martinique, where the niece had arrived to complicate matters. He had a no-good brother aboard, and officers with identifiable and interesting traits, moments of fatigue, anger, despair, mortification and sober triumph. That is about all you need to know if you know Mr. Forester, except that this time the actions are a little less elaborate and the love angle a little more plausible and easy to take. If you don't know Mr. Forester and his testaments in square rig, you should.

OTIS FERGUSON

Reply to Mr. Ickes

Bureaucracy Convicts Itself, by Alpheus Thomas Mason. New York: The Viking Press. 224 pages. $2.50.

THE STORY of the Ballinger-Pinchot controversy of 1910, often told in the biographies of Taft, Brandeis and their contemporaries, is now the sole subject of a book. It might well be called the "Ickes-Mason controversy." For Professor Mason has apparently been moved, by Secretary Ickes' "essay of confession and penance" in defense of Ballinger, which appeared last spring in The Saturday Evening Post, to reëxamine this dispute which helped wreck the Taft administration.

Richard Achilles Ballinger was Theodore Roosevelt's General Land Office Commissioner and Taft's Secretary of the Interior. His failure to cancel certain questionable land claims made him the target of Collier's and other muck-raking journals, the subject of a congressional investigation, and a resignee from office six months later. This personal misfortune gave Louis D. Brandeis increased national prominence and was a victory for the "conservationists," who resented Taft's deviation from his predecessor's land policies.

The disputed land claims, known as the "Cunningham claims," were subsequently declared invalid because the Guggenheim trust had an option on them in violation of the land laws. For several years, Louis R. Glavis, a field agent in the Department of the Interior had urged Ballinger, his superior, to declare them invalid. His efforts failed, and, aided by Gifford Pinchot, the country's leading conservationist, he brought charges of misconduct against Ballinger which resulted in his own dismissal. When Collier's took up the fight, there was a congressional investigation from which Ballinger emerged formally vindicated but in fact disgraced.

Secretary Ickes' provocative article sought to justify its title, "Not Guilty! Richard A. Ballinger—An American Dreyfus." He states that "Ballinger was . . . destroyed politically by Pinchot on the trumped-up charge that he was an enemy of conservation," and refers to "the Pinchot intrigue [as] one of the dirtiest in American history." What inspired this change of mind by the liberal Secretary to whom complainant Glavis owed his return to government service? Ickes attributes it to Henry F. Pringle's conservative biography of Taft, which led him to examine the record through "fresh minds that had no prejudices or preconceived notions." On the other hand, Mason suggests that Pinchot's opposition to the President's reorganization bill of 1937 might have some relevance.

Regardless of the motives of authorship, Ickes' charges are effectively refuted by this careful study of Professor Mason. We see that Ballinger was not the mere victim of Brandeis' clever cross examination before the investigating committee, but of his own improper conduct. Answering Ickes' surprising claim that Ballinger himself was a conservationist, Mason cites the three million acres of Western land withdrawn by Ballinger from the public domain upon his appointment as Secretary. He refutes Ickes' claim of his predecessor's innocence by relating how Ballinger, while temporarily out of government service prior to his appointment by Taft, drew an affidavit for Clarence Cunningham, then his client; this was intended to controvert the effect of Cunningham's incriminating journal in the government's possession. Mr. Ickes praises Ballinger the government official for transferring to his assistant these cases in which Ballinger the lawyer had appeared. But Mason argues, quite properly, that a good public servant, with Ballinger's knowledge of the facts, would personally have canceled these claims. As for Ickes' assertion that "Taft scrupulously examined the records" before exonerating Ballinger and dismissing Glavis, numerous investigators from Brandeis to Matthew Josephson and Mason have shown that examination to be casual or imaginary.

Professor Mason has won the battle. His publishers ought to make the Ickes' article an insert of Mason's scholarly refutation. For the two polemics make an exciting debate in which the Secretary enjoys the novelty of defeat. One may question Professor Mason's statement that this story has great significance today in warning against "bureau-

British Labor Speaks!

A Dinner to Honor

COL. JOSIAH WEDGWOOD

Labour Party Member of Parliament Just Arrived from England

GUEST SPEAKERS

RALPH BATES — SAMUEL GRAFTON
BRUCE BLIVEN — FREDA KIRCHWEY
GEORGE S. COUNTS — EDGAR ANSEL MOWRER

Thursday evening, June 26 — 7 P. M.

At the Air-Cooled HOTEL COMMODORE—42nd St. & Lexington Ave.

Auspices: UNION FOR DEMOCRATIC ACTION

202 West 40th Street — Tel.: LA 4-9565

Reservations made in advance — $2.50 per plate

OUR DEFENSE OF FREEDOM

TAMIMENT CONFERENCE: 1941, Tamiment, Penna.

Five sessions — Thursday evening to Sunday forenoon

JUNE 26 - 29

A thrilling program, held in new Tamiment Playhouse. Time for enjoyment of all the sports and recreations of America's finest camp.

A Few of the Speakers

JAN VALTIN, author, "Out of the Night"; ISAAC DON LEVINE, journalist; MRS. J. BORDEN HARRIMAN, U. S. Minister to Norway; HERBERT AGAR; editor, Louisville Courier-Journal; THOMAS KENNEDY, Sec.-Treas. United Mine Workers; DAVID SAPOSS, Research Expert; RALPH WILLIAM CLOSE, Minister from the Union of South Africa; ALGERNON LEE, Pres. Rand School; DR. FRANK KINGDON, author-lecturer;
LOUIS WALDMAN, CHAIRMAN.

RATE: $15.00 for three days. Additional for De Luxe.

Further information and reservations:

CAMP TAMIMENT, 7 East 15th Street, New York City
ALgonquin 4-3441

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cratic aggrandizement"; there are many more disturbing problems that cry for research and solution. But this is a book of merit and interest which achieves its destructive purpose.

LEONARD BOUDIN

Report by the Scientists

New Worlds in Science, an anthology edited by Harold Ward. New York: Robert McBride and Company. 670 pages. $3.50.

HAROLD WARD, familiar to readers of The New Republic as a frequent reviewer of books on science, conceived the useful idea of making an anthology of recent writings in that field. The result is this fat volume, a selection of the Scientific Book Club. Here are found chapters from works of many leading scientists of the day, as well as some of the abler popularizers. His list of authors includes Albert Einstein, Julian Huxley, Robert A. Millikan, Hans Zinsser, Ruth Benedict, Kirtley Mather, Bertrand Russell, Paul Sears, Waldemar Kaempffert and twenty-four others.

Naturally, such an anthology is not entirely logical in its arrangement; and for reasons of space, Mr. Ward has had to omit some important ideas and people. On the whole, however, his is a skillful piece of compilation, with here and there an inspired stroke, as when he assembles from three successive reports of the Rockefeller Foundation a warning about the invasion of the Western Hemisphere by the mosquito which carries the dangerous West African malaria.

B. B.

Contributors

WAYNE GARD is an editorial writer on the staff of The Dallas Morning News.

WILLIAM STEELE MCCAULEY is an instructor in the Department of Government at Harvard. He has been working on a study of Britain's industrial-mobilization, financial and labor policies.

JUDD POLK has contributed verse to The New Yorker and other magazines.

RICHARD L. NEUBERGER is the author of "An Army of the Aged" and "Our Promised Land," and co-author, with Stephen B. Kahn, of "Integrity: The Life of George W. Norris." He was recently elected to the Oregon State Legislature.

W. H. AUDEN is the well known English playwright and poet, now living in this country.

LOUIS FISCHER's latest book is "Men and Politics: An Autobiography," published by Duell, Sloan and Pearce.

JAMES STERN, who lives in New York City, is the Irish author of two collections of short stories, "The Heartless Land" and "Something Wrong." Other work of his has appeared in Harper's Bazaar, Esquire and Story.

WILLMOORE KENDALL teaches political science and economics at Hobart College. The University of Illinois Press will soon release his first book, "John Locke and the Doctrine of Majority Rule."

LEONARD BOUDIN is a specialist in labor and administrative law, the author of "The Rights of Strikers" in a recent issue of The Illinois Law Review and a contributor to Science and Society, The National Lawyers' Guild Quarterly and other publications.

Other Resorts in the Selected Listing

PHOENICIA, N. Y.

The Woodlands
THE FOUR-SEASON RESORT
How can one put into a space so limited the incomparable beauty of our setting, our superb food, the raves of our guests when we made our debut over the Decoration Day week-end! You will just have to see for yourselves and we have nary a qualm in thinking you won't regret it. Special June rates.
Siggie R. Goldner, Phoenicia, New York

ARMONK, N. Y.

BREEZEMONT PARK
ARMONK, N.Y.
"A Country Estate in the Scenic Hills of Westchester County"
If you choose your hotel with the same care and taste as you would your home, visit this nearby resort. Exclusive, dignified, luxuriously furnished. All sport facilities. Excellent cuisine. Less than 1 hour from N. Y. C. Open All Year
Phone: Armonk Village 955

CHILDREN'S CAMP

ALYSSUM
"DAY CAMP FOR BOYS AND GIRLS"
Something entirely new in accommodations for parents and children. A luxurious hotel combined with a modern camp for boys and girls. 3-12. Cultural, occupational work.
Write for particulars, Box 7, Armonk, N. Y.

SUMMER RENTAL

COMMUTING HARMON-PEEKSKILL. Bungalows. All conveniences, including electric refrigeration, automatic hot water. All athletic facilities. Reduced $225-$350 season. UNderhill 3-4150 or Peekskill 1722 J.

RENT OR SHARE

LAKESIDE attractive 4-room house, spacious lawn. Charmingly furnished. All improvements. Mohegan Colony. Crompond, N. Y. Horovitz, WO 2-1997.

BOOK

THE CLEAREST explanation of democratic socialism in the English language is What's So and What Isn't, by John M. Work. This is the reason for its many editions and total sale of more than 182,000 copies. With the world in flux, it is of the utmost importance that intelligent men and women should be informed about a social order which millions of earnest, sensible people in many country believe to be the only practical and permanent solution of the problems of war, unemployment and poverty. Read it. $1.00.
Frank Zeidler, 536 West Juneau Avenue, Milwaukee, Wisconsin.

SANDALS

How to Read or Write a Book
Concentrate ● Be Comfortable ● Wear
MONK'S SANDALS

Reproductions of Fifteenth Century mission slippers; hand-made in Mexico, of odorless chrome tanned cow-hide saddle leather, with heel grip and woven top thongs. No stitches, glue or nails. Send size and outline of foot with $1 (plus 10c post.) to 55 E. Wacker Dr.
HEMISPHERE TRADING COMM. Chicago, Ill.

LANGUAGES

speak read **SPANISH**
QUICKLY, EASILY, CORRECTLY
The Linguaphone Method enables you to speak SPANISH—or any of 29 languages—by LISTENING to voices of native teachers *in your own home.* Amazingly simple, thorough, sound; FREE BOOK.
LINGUAPHONE INSTITUTE
30 RCA Building New York City

BARGAIN PHONOGRAPH COURSES. We sell, rent, purchase, exchange. All makes. 20 different sets in French alone. Mail Orders. Request Booklet R.
LANGUAGE SERVICE, 18 East 41st St., N. Y. C.

APARTMENT FOR RENT

FURNISHED APARTMENT, window over East River, breezy, quiet, secluded street; 2 bedrooms, grand piano, reasonable to non-destructives. 31 Beekman Place, PLaza 5-6509.

WEARING APPAREL

BECAUSE WE CLOSE June 28th for entire summer, every lovely model dress, suit and coat is offered at absolute clearance. During June consult with us regarding vacation clothes problem. Miss Goodman, 474 Seventh Avenue (at 36th St.), LA 4-4013.

Advertising Rates

The New REPUBLIC

For Summer Announcements and Rentals

Classified
50c a type line for 6 point
6 words to the line
45c a type line for 5 point
7 words to the line
Minimum ad: 3 lines

Display
1 inch (1 x 2¼) --- $4.50
1 inch (1 x 3⅜) --- $6.75

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED